

A N
ANSWER to a Popish Book,
INTITLED,

*A True and Modest Account of the Chief
Points in Controversie, between the Ro-
man Catholicks and the Protestants.*

Together with some Considerations upon the
SERMONS of a DIVINE of the
Church of England. By N. C.

WHEREIN

The OBJECTIONS N. C. has brought
against the ARGUMENTS which His Grace

J O H N,

Late Lord Archbishop of Canterbury,
Made use of in

His SERMONS against Popery,

Are considered; and answered on these following Heads:

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. <i>The Church of Rome
not Catholick.</i> | 6. <i>Prayers in an unknown
Tongue.</i> |
| 2. <i>The Supremacy.</i> | 7. <i>The Invocation of
Saints.</i> |
| 3. <i>The Infallibility of the
Church.</i> | 8. <i>Images.</i> |
| 4. <i>Transubstantiation.</i> | 9. <i>Purgatory.</i> |
| 5. <i>Communion in one Kind.</i> | 10. <i>Indulgences.</i> |

*Design'd for the Use of such as are in danger of being per-
verted by the Emissaries of the Church of Rome.*

I am fully convinced, that the Insolent Behaviour of
the Papists has made what you advise necessary to be
done, for the Safety of my Person and Government, and
the Welfare of my People.

Her Majesty's most Gracious Answer to the Lord's Address.

L O N D O N: Printed for W. Hawes, at the Bible and
Rose in Ludgate-street. 1706.



A N S W E R T O T H E P R E F A C E.

TH E Design of the Book intituled *A True and Modest Account, &c.* being as the Author tells us in the beginning of his Preface, *To answer the most Material Objections in Dr. Tillotson's Sermons*; as also, *To lay down the Grounds on which the Popish Religion is founded.* My Business at present shall be, only to make good the Force of those Arguments which his Grace has urg'd against *Popery*; and to shew that they still remain firm and unshaken, notwithstanding all those Objections which have been brought against them; reserving the Consideration of the *Grounds on which the Popish Religion is founded* to a Second Part, that this Treatise may not swell to too large a bulk, but be more useful to convince those of their Errors who have been bred up in the Communion of the *Church of Rome*; and to confirm such who are unsettled in their Principles, in the serious Belief of the *Protestant Religion.*

For tho' we have many Excellent Books, in which the Controversies between the *Church of Rome* and the *Protestants* are plainly stated, and

solidly and learnedly discuss'd; yet they are in a great measure render'd ineffectual; because the Generality of those who live in Communion with the *Church of Rome*, either want the Will, or the Ability, or Permission to read them: But the *Archbishop's Sermons*, besides the Plainness and Familiarity of the Expression, and the other Beauties of the Stile, have also this Advantage beyond other Controversial Writings; that his Arguments against *Papery*, being intermixt with more Practical Truths, are read with Pleasure and Delight, by such Persons who would never endure the fatigue of turning over, and considering a Book writ closely, and consisting only of dry Argumentation.

The *Papists* are taught to believe as their Church believes, without weighing or considering why they do so; they must not trust their own Understandings, nor their Senses in Matters of the nearest Importance, which concern their Eternal Salvation; but repose themselves on their infallible Guide, and give themselves up intirely to its Conduct: They are kept as much as 'tis possible in the dark, and diverted from reading any Controversies in Religion, even those which are written by their own Authors; which is the Reason why their great Champion *Bellarmino* is so scarce in *Popish* Countries. And from hence it was, that the Gentlewoman, for whose Satisfaction *N. C.* wrote his Book; who had never took the pains to inquire into the Reason of her Faith, nor had consider'd what the *Scriptures* say of the Articles of her Creed, was so surpriz'd when she first read the *Archbishop's Sermons*; where the crafty Wiliness of the *Papists* is so plainly detected, and their
Super-

Answer to the Preface.

5

Superstition and Idolatry prov'd, by such evident Arguments and undeniable Facts; that tho' they may find out many specious Pretences, nice Distinctions, and subtle Evasions, to impose upon the Unwary and Ignorant, and to deceive the weak in Faith; yet will they be manifest to every considerate and unprejudic'd Reader. N. C. indeed pretends to have remov'd his Lady's *Scruples*, and to refute the Archbishop by Scripture, Reason, and the Authority of the Fathers; but if he made use of no other Arguments than those he is pleas'd to afford us in his Book, I believe the Reader will soon judge on how Sandy a Foundation her *Satisfaction* was built.

For his usual course thro' the whole Work, is rather to obscure, than enlighten his Subject; to render the Controversy more perplex'd, instead of explaining it; to introduce some nice and unintelligible Notion of the Schools, to misapply some plain Text of Scripture, to quote some Half-Sentence out of the Fathers, to furnish out some stale Argument, which neither that poor Lady, who had never been *sufficiently instructed in the Principles of her Religion*, nor any plain and illiterate Reader can understand; and provided he says something with an Appearance of Truth, 'tis no matter how little to the purpose: Whereas he ought to have grounded his Arguments on the *Holy Scripture* and solid Reason; and to have made Proof of the *Popish* Tenents, by such plain, easy, and familiar Arguments, that every Rational Person might understand them, such as the Archbishop's incomparable Sermons every where abound with.

A ;

For

For 'tis not to be imagin'd, that the Strefs of our Salvation should depend on Secular Learning, or the reading the Schoolmen or Fathers; no, we have a *more sure Word of Testimony*, to which if we give heed we shall do well; which is so plain and evident in all Points absolutely necessary to Salvation, that *he who runs may read it*. Tis from the Holy Scriptures alone, *those Fountains of Living Water*, from whence we derive all the Fundamental Articles of our Faith, and are instructed in all the necessary Truths of our Religion: And tho' the Fathers of the Church are held by us in great Esteem, especially those who wrote in the first Centuries, whilst the Christian Religion continued pure and uncorrupted; and we lay a great Strefs on the Authority of such Ecclesiastical Historians, as were Men of Probity and Vertue: Yet do we look with far greater Veneration on those Divine Books, which were pen'd by the Immediate Inspiration of the Holy Ghost: Not that we have the least Suspicion, that the *Protestant Religion* will not bear a Tryal by the *Ancient Fathers of the Church*, or maintain its Claim to Antiquity and Purity by the dint of Secular Learning: This has been made out long ago, beyond all Contradiction, and several of our Learned Divines have challeng'd the *Papists* to produce one Sentence out of the *Ancient Fathers* in Favour of *Popery*, which was not foisted into them, or the Text corrupted. The *Papists* do indeed make their Brags of the Unity, Universality, and Antiquity of their *Church*, and hereby too often impose upon the unlearned and unwary Reader: But 'twill be evident to every one who carefully examines, and looks narrowly into the

the Grounds of their Pretences; that Popery is a late Invention, introduc'd by degrees into the Christian Church, consisting of Innovations in Faith and Practice, devis'd on purpose to support the Grandeur and Temporal Interest of the *Church of Rome*; and that 'tis widely different from that Profession of Faith deliver'd down by Christ and his Apostles, and believ'd and practis'd in the Purest Ages of the Church. This might easily be made good, but at present I shall confine my self only to those Arguments which *his Grace* has urg'd in his Sermons; as being adapted to the meanest Capacity, and those of the weaker Sex, who are in most danger of being perverted by the Emissaries of the *Church of Rome*: And if I do not give his Learned Citations a full Animadversion here, I hope it will not be esteem'd a faulty Omission in me; since N. C. tells us, the main Design of his Book is, *to instruct the Weak and Ignorant, and not to please the Curious.*

In two things, N. C. bespeaks the Reader's Favour, and pleads for his Excuse,

First, that he doth not give the Archbishop his due Title, and for this the Reason is obvious, tho' he will not speak out, and tell us plainly, that he doth not own him to be a Bishop: But there can be no Shadow of a Reason given, nor the least Excuse pretended, for those *hard Words*, as he calls them; that Rude and Scurrilous Treatment which he bestows on this most Reverend Prelate, so freely in several parts of his Book; especially, when he gave us hopes of more civil usage, by promising, *That he would shew all the Respect that might be expected, without betraying the Cause*; But 'tis plain, by

that *Liberty of Speech*, which he uses, that even in matters of common Civility, and decency of Expression, *Faith is not to be kept with Hereticks.*

Had he transcrib'd that Copy the Good Archbishop set him, he might have learn'd, that Controversies may be managed with Civility, and a due Respect to the Characters of our Adversaries, *without betraying the Cause*; that *soft Words*, and *hard Arguments*, are of greater force than Calumny and Railing; and that the smooth and oily Stile sinks deeper, and makes a more lasting Impression, than the Salt and Vinegar of the more Passionate Controversists.

It is true, the Archbishop sometimes diverts himself and his Reader with the Foppery and Impertinencies of the *Popish* Authors, their unsound Reasonings and absurd Consequences, but never at the expence of good Manners, or good Breeding; he every where mingles his sharpest Reflections on the Cause, with Charity to the Person, reconciles Controversy with Good Nature, and hath shewn himself to be not only a Skilful Divine, and an Able Disputant; but also a Good Man, and one of the civilest Gentleman-like Persons in the World.

The second Address which N. C. makes, is to the Magistrate. He was, it seems, aware that such poysonous Doctrine, such seditious Principles, such insolent Railing, was likely to awaken the Governours of our Church and State, and to whet the Edge of Penal Laws against *Popish* Recusants; who live securely and peaceably, and are protected in their Properties and Liberties,

ties, whilst the *Protestants* in Foreign Parts suffer Persecution, and undergo the severest Penalties for the sake of Religion, and a good Conscience ; But his blind and intemperate Zeal made him turn a deaf Ear to those Carnal Motives, and to disregard all prudential Considerations, so he could but advance the End of his Mission, the making Profelytes to the *Papish* Religion ; which may give us a seasonable intimation of the dangerous Consequence of harbouring such furious Zealots in *Protestant* Countries.

I do not write this to incense the Magistrates against them, or to promote a prosecution of the Penal Laws ; For I could wish that Liberty of Conscience, in Matters purely speculative, which is so agreeable to the Law of Nature, were the Law of Nations too : But 'tis certainly the Duty of the Magistrate, and an Essential Part of his Office to take care, *Ne quid detrimenti Respublica capiat*, that the Community receive no Prejudice from the bitter Zeal and superstitious Capriches of the Emissaries of the Church of *Rome*.

For the *Papists* are not so inconsiderable a Party in *England* as some Men are pleas'd to represent them : Their Revenues here set apart for the propagating the Faith are very great, near Fourscore thousand Pounds *per Ann.* and their Priests very numerous, and by some of their own Religion said to amount to Three thousand ; which I have the more reason to give credit to, by comparing this Account with that of the Priests in *Ireland*, where they are much more numerous, as the List of their Names given in to the Government, by the Articles of *Limerick*, will inform us. Add to this, that they are all dependent on a
Foreign

Foreign Head, and supported by a powerful Confederacy; and then I think it will appear highly reasonable, that such care ought to be taken, that it may not be in their power to disturb the Government, and to make us and themselves too, Slaves to the Ambition of a Universal Monarch. And that this is no Chimera, or ungrounded Supposition is plain, from that Concern which the *Papists* here in *England* always express for the Interest of *France*, and that in the highest degree; as plainly appear'd by their Refusal, to comply with the Invitation of the *Portugal* Ambassador on the Day, for the Publick Thanksgiving for the Victory of *Blenheim*; which will remain a lasting and notorious Instance of their Disaffection to our Government, as well as Religion.

appoint-
ment

'Tis true, the Sons of the Church of *England* are mild, patient and charitable, ready to give a kind and friendly Reception to all those who differ from them, and live peaceably and quietly under the Government; but 'tis the Interest of these Gentlemen to take care that they do not abuse this *Patience* (as this Author has done) by reviling the Governours of our Church with such opprobrious Language, printing Books in which their basest Arguments are trump'd up again, and only varnish'd over in order to deceive poor ignorant People, and seduce them from their Religion and Allegiance, for *Leſa Patientia fit Furor*.

I readily acknowledge, that several of our *English Papists* are Men of excellent Tempers, and (even contrary to their Principles) have behav'd themselves Loyally in a time of Trial,
and

Answer to the Preface.

11

and are affectionately concern'd for the Good of their native Country; and I am heartily sorry they are not all so: For when the Leaders and Guides of their Consciences are once arriv'd to that boldness, as to tell us to our Faces and the whole World in Print, that we are Schismatics and Hereticks, and to upbraid us with that Sacrilege which was committed in *Popish* Times, and by zealous *Papists*, which they themselves are most guilty of; by robbing the People of the Cup in the Sacrament, of the Holy Scriptures, and as the Archbishop ingeniously expresses it, *stealing away the Tenth Commandment in the Face of the Eighth*; and when this is done at a time when (as the Author himself acknowledges) *they are over-look'd by the Government, and partake largely of the unmerited Goodness and Clemency of the Church of England*; they certainly take the ready way to put our Magistrates upon the Debate, whether they ought to be *over-look'd* still.

Second

A N S W E R

A N S W E R

T O T H E

I N T R O D U C T I O N .

TH E R E is nothing whereby a Man's Disposition and Temper of Mind is made more evident, than by his Stile and Manner of Writing; so that let a man take what caution he can, or use never so much Art to conceal his true Sentiments and natural Disposition, yet the Passions of his Mind will by some means or other discover themselves, and the Spirit and Soul of the Man will be represented in this Mirror: And if so, then it will certainly be an undeniable Instance of the real Worth, the unaffected Piety, the genuine Humanity and Composedness of Mind, with which the late Archbishop of *Canterbury* was endow'd; that even his Controversial Writings were pen'd with such Smoothness of Stile, and Candor of Expression, and a generous Disdain of those many Calumnies and Reflections which were continually cast upon him, *not rendering Railing for Railing, but on the contrary Blessing*; and like the Sun, neglecting those Clamors which were occasioned only by his Height and Brightness: And in this Class the Author of the *True and Modest Account, &c.* has plac'd himself,

For

For if ever any meer human Author wrote with Strength of Argument and Demonstration, as well as Accurateness of Stile and Politeness of Expression, it was certainly the late Archbishop of Canterbury; and yet the Author of the *True and Modest Account, &c.* will allow him only the mean Commendation of an *Ingenious Person*: But, as he insinuates, without any sound Sense or solid Argumentation, by which he betrays his own want of Capacity, Learning and good Sense; of which he has given us another Instance, in the Judgment he passes on the Dispute between his Grace and Mr. Serjeant, who (as he tells us) was *so great a Wit, and so indefatigable a Writer, and by much superiour to the Ingenious Dr. Tillotson*: In Answer to which, I shall refer the Reader to the Preface to the First Volume of the Archbishop's Sermons, where he will find a full and satisfactory Account of the Controversie between them, and plainly discover how little N. C. is to be depended on for his Character of Men, as well as his Judgment of Controversies in Religion, and how trifling an Author Mr. Serjeant is.

But to come nearer to the Point, he tells us that his *Design*, in his Introduction to his Book, is to undermine the *Foundation* upon which the Archbishop built all his Controversial Writings against the Church of Rome. This indeed was a great and dangerous *Design*, which if this *Goliath* had been able to accomplish, he might have spar'd himself the labour of planting a formal Battery against the rest of his Arguments, and writing his Book.

He tells us, that the Archbishop laid down this Fundamental Principle: *That whatsoever is plain*

plain and evident to our Senses and Reason, is to be believ'd, tho' all the Men and Churches in the World should persuade us to the contrary; as that two and two make four: And thus far he owns him to be in the right, as every Man of Sense and Reason must do; tho' a little after he is pleas'd to deny it in pag. 19. where he prefers the Authority of Tradition even before the Evidence of Sense, and supposes that tho' God's Goodness will not put it into Man's Heart to tell a Lie, yet his Wisdom may have Reasons to impose upon the Senses.

But he says, that from this *Fundamental Principle*, it doth not follow that this is the Protestant's Case with regard to the *Papists*; no, I grant it doth not follow from thence, nor did the Archbishop make so silly an Inference: But it doth necessarily follow from this Supposition, that if the Tenents of the Church of *Rome* are contrary to Sense and Reason, they must needs be false; if they should teach that two and two do not make four, but five, or that the Substance which I eat, and which my Senses inform me is Bread, is not Bread, but the Body of a Man, *that then they ought not to be believ'd, tho' never so many Men or Churches should combine together to affirm those Propositions to be true.* And this is plain from hence, because Sense and Reason are more certain Judges of Truth than any Human Authority can be. The best Man in the World may be deceiv'd in his Opinions of Things, he may be bias'd by Prejudice and Interest; Bodies of Men have been so, and Councils have err'd; but Sense and Reason are the surest *Criteria* of Truth; and upon their Testimony all the Certainty which we have of Things is founded. To this N. C. answers, That if our
Senses

Senses and Reason are to be credited before Authority, or Antient Tradition, that then the Church of *Rome*, and several other Churches, have been in an Error for many Years, and mistaken in several Points of their Religion, and have introduc'd into their Church several Tenents contrary to the Testimony of Sense and Reason: And all this I readily grant, nay, that the *Roman* Church was, and still continues so much corrupted, that it requires the utmost of our Charity to believe it a true, tho' a very unsound part of the Catholick Church of Christ. For as the Archbishop tells us, (*Vol. 6. p. 261.*) " It is not necessary that
 " the whole Christian Church, or any part of
 " it, should be free from all Errors and Cor-
 " ruptions; even the Churches planted by the
 " Apostles in the Primitive Times were not so.
 " St. *Paul* reproveth several Doctrines and Pra-
 " ctices in the Church of *Corinth*, and of *Coloss*,
 " and of *Galatia*; and the Spirit of God several
 " things in the seven Churches of *Asia*; and
 " yet all these were Parts and Members of the
 " Catholick Church of Christ, because they a-
 " greed in the main and essential Doctrines of
 " Christianity; And when more and greater
 " Corruptions grew in the Church, the greater
 " need there was of a Reformation. And as
 " every particular Person has a right to Reform
 " any thing that he finds amiss in himself, so far
 " as concerns himself; so much more every
 " National Church hath a Power within it
 " self to Reform it self from all Errors and Cor-
 " ruptions: And whatever Part of the Church,
 " how Great and Eminent soever, excludes from
 " her

16 *Answer to the Introduction.*

“ her Communion such a National Church for
 “ Reforming her self from plain Errors and Cor-
 “ ruptions, clearly condemn'd by the Word of
 “ God, and by the Doctrine and Practice of
 “ the Primitive Christian Church, it is undoubt-
 “ edly guilty of *Schism* : And this is the Truth
 “ of the Case between Us and the Church of
 “ Rome.

And in order to make Proof of this, I shall consider :

First, *What Arguments his Grace has made use of on the several Heads.*

Secondly, *What N. C. has advanc'd in abatement to the Force of them.*

Thirdly, I shall endeavour to give a plain and clear Answer to all his Objections ; whereby 'twill become evident to every honest and intelligent Reader, that notwithstanding all those nice Distinctions which have been lately invented to recencile those Contradictions we charge upon the Church of Rome ; the Softenings which have been given to their Opinions, and the Misrepresentations which have been made of them, contrary to their known Practice, and the Sense of their most allow'd Authors : Yet Popery is a Religion which teaches Doctrines directly contrary to the Revelation of the Holy Scriptures, the Dictates of Right Reason, and the Evidence of our Senses ; And if so, that then no Person can now continue in the Communion of the Church of Rome, without extreme hazard of his Salvation : And that such Protestants who have been once enlightned with the Knowledge of the Truth, and yet renounce their Holy Faith, and turn Papists, are guilty of a Sin of the deepest Die, and of that Apostacy which is near akin to the Sin against the Holy Ghost.

T H E

Roman Church not Catholick,

And of the

Supremacy and Infallibility.

WHEN the Church of *Rome*, which was deservedly eminent in the Times of the Apostles, and some succeeding Ages, for the Soundness of its Faith, and the Exemplary Lives of its Professors, had by degrees in a long Tract of Time so far corrupted itself, as to become guilty of notorious Superstition and Idolatry; then it pleased God to raise up many *Worthies*, Men endowed with an Apostolical Spirit, and a Primitive Zeal for the Truth, who, with the hazard of all their Worldly Interests, set about *that Great and Glorious Work*, The Reforming the Church, and restoring it to its Primitive Purity and Holiness.

But as soon as (by the Blessing of God) our first Reformers had made some Progress in it, and it became visible to the
B
World;

World, that there were many notorious Errors, many Superstitious and Idolatrous Practices in the Church of *Rome*, such as could not be justified either by Reason or Scripture; then those whose Interest inclin'd them to retain these Corruptions, made it their Business either to defend them by some plausible Arguments, or at least to palliate them by some frivolous Excuses; and amongst those, the Doctrine of the *Infallibility of the Church*, was esteem'd the main Prop by which *Popery* was to be upheld and supported.

For, if *the Church cannot err in delivering the Doctrine she receiv'd from Jesus Christ, nor mistake in her Explanation thereof*; then (as they tell us) we have nothing else to do, but first to inquire which is the True Church? and secondly, what this Church Teaches? and (without troubling our selves farther about the particular Controversies of Religion) to take up our Faith on Trust, and sit down and believe whatsoever the Spiritual Guides of the Church dictate to us, and we shall be sav'd. Now, the *Papists* would have us be so good natur'd as to take it for granted:

1. *That the Holy Catholick Church doth consist only of such Members as are in Communion with the Church of Rome*; and that all those who are excommunicated by it, (which is the greatest Part of the Christian

Christian World) are no true Members of the *Catholick Church* , nor have they any Possibility of Obtaining Salvation : And if we can once be brought to believe that the Church of *Rome* is the only true Church , then it will be natural to infer from hence ;

2. That the *Pope* is the Supream Head of the Church.

3. That Infallibility is so surely lodg'd in the Church of *Rome* , that whatsoever that Church defines to be necessary to be believ'd, ought to be assented to by every good Christian, on Pain of Eternal Damnation.

This at first sight seems to be a short and easy Way of ending Controversies, and freeing Mens Minds from such Scruples and Doubts , as for the most part perplex the most sober and honest Persons ; such as are best disposed , and have the most serious sense of Religion. It seems indeed to be a plain and direct Path at the first entrance , but when we are gone on a little way in it, there will soon appear so many crooked Windings and Turnings, that we shall be more perplex'd to find out the right Way than we were before. For,

1. It cannot be made out, that the Church of *Rome* is the *Catholick Church* Nor,

2. That the *Pope* is the Supream Head of the Church. Nor,

3. That there is any Infallibility lodg'd in it: But the direct contrary is evident, from those Arguments which *His Grace* has urg'd in his Sermons.

1. That the Church of *Rome* is not the *Catholick Church* he proves;

1. Because to affirm this, is to be guilty of the same Absurdity, as to say, That a Part is the Whole; for the Church of *Rome* is only a Particular Part of the Universal Church, and therefore cannot be the *Catholick* or the Whole Church.

To this *N.C.* answers, That by the *Roman Church*, the Papists do not mean the Diocese of *Rome*, which in a strict sense may be call'd the Church of *Rome*; but all Christian Churches over the World, in Communion with the Particular Church or See of *Rome*, not as submitting to its Jurisdiction, but only as 'tis the Centre and Principle of *Catholick Unity*.

But 'tis evident, That this is not a true Representation of the Matter of Fact; for the *Papists* own no other Members of the Church of *Rome*, but those who own the Supremacy, and submit themselves to the Authority and Jurisdiction of the Pope of *Rome*. It being declared, in their Canon Law, necessary to Salvation, that every

Hu-

Humane Creature should be subject to the Bishop of *Rome*. And this is confirm'd by the last *Lateran* Council. But supposing that they do mean no more, because *N.C.* tells us so; why then should they be so fond of this Appellation, *Roman Catholick Church*? Why should not the *Universal Christian Church* do as well? Why should they study to adorn the *Church of Rome* with so many Glorious Titles, which do not belong to her? The *Church of Rome*, we grant, is an eminent Part of the *Christian Church*; but that this Part can comprehend the Whole, that we deny. For it doth no where appear, nor are the Papists able to make it out, that the *Church of Rome* was invested with any peculiar Privileges beyond other *Christian Churches* planted by the Apostles; or that she was to be the Mother and Mistress of all other Churches. For *Jerusalem* was certainly the Mother-Church; there was the first *Christian Church* planted, and from thence all *Christian Churches* in the World derive themselves. For if *Rome* was the Mother and Mistress of all other Churches, 'twill be difficult to account why *St. Paul*, in a long Epistle to that Church, takes no notice of it: So that in all probability he was ignorant of those mighty Prerogatives of the *Church of Rome*, otherwise it cannot be imagin'd but he would have written

with more *deference* to the *Mother-Church*, the Centre of Unity, and Seat of infallibility ; where the Vicar of *Christ* was, by his Appointment, to fix his Throne, and establish his Residence.

But says N. C. if you allow the *Church of Rome* to be part of the *Catholick Church*, then 'tis certain, even to Demonstration, that it must be the *whole Catholick Church*, p. 99. but where to find this Demonstration, or any probable Argument to prove it, I cannot tell.

He tells us indeed, that one Faith and one Communion are essential to the Constitution of the *Catholick Church* ; therefore those who do not hold the same Faith, nor are in Communion with the *Church of Rome*, are not Parts or true Members of the *Catholick Church*.

1. But to this the Answer is very easie, that the same Fundamental Articles of Faith, and the same Sacraments and Offices of Religion are essentially necessary to the Constitution of the *Catholick Church* ; but it is not necessary that all Parts of the *Catholick Church* agree in every Point of Religion, or maintain mutually external Communion one with another. For the Church of Christ may fall into many Errors, and will have many Rents and Divisions, and one particular Church may excommunicate another, and yet both still remain

remain Members of the Universal Church. That Church indeed which retains the greatest Purity of Doctrine, and whose Constitution is most conformable to the Practice of our Saviour and his Apostles, is the most sound Member of the *Catholick Church*: But whatsoever Church holds the Head, and professes the fundamental Points of the Christian Religion, and retains the same Sacraments and Ordinances of Christ; that Church is a true and real Member of the *Catholick Church*, tho' there may be many Errors or corrupt Practices (such as put Men in very great hazard of their Salvation) found in it, and tho' it may not hold an external Communion with all other Churches. And if so, then it will follow, *That other Societies of Christian Churches, who have not external Communion with the Church of Rome, but are excommunicated by it, are Parts of the Catholick Church*; and therefore the Church of *Rome* comprehends only a part, and not the whole Church, as will more evidently appear, because,

2. The Churches of *Asia*, which were Excommunicated by the Bishops of *Rome*, for not keeping *Easter* as they did; and the Churches of *Asia* and *Africa*, upon the Point of Rebaptizing Hereticks, were hereby turn'd out of the Communion of the *Roman Church*, and yet did still continue

in the Communion of the *Catholick Church*; which could not possibly be, if the *Roman Church* and the *Catholick Church* were the same.

This Argument N. C. tells us, is grounded upon a Fallacy, because the Bishop of *Rome* and the *Roman Church* are not the same; and whoever said they were? the Bishop of a Church and the Church over which he is Bishop, are certainly two very different things. But is it not the same thing to be Excommunicated by the Bishop of *Rome*, and to be Excommunicated out of the *Roman Church*? And if so, then the *Catholick Church* and the *Roman Church* are not the same, nor of the like Extent; because those who are Excommunicated out of the *Roman Church*, may still remain Members of the *Catholick* or *Universal Christian Church*.

3. The Papists themselves hold, That the Baptism of Children by Hereticks, is good and valid, and makes them Members of the *Catholick Church*; but Baptism confer'd by a Heretick doth not make the Person Baptiz'd a Member of the *Roman Church*, therefore the *Catholick* and the *Roman Church* are not the same.

To this Argument N. C. answers, That Baptism confer'd by Hereticks is good and valid, and that such Persons who are baptiz'd by them, are made Members of the
Roman

Roman Church, unless they cast themselves out of the Church when they come to Age by partaking of the same Schism or Heresie, and that even Hereticks receive a true Character of Baptism; but that this Character doth not make them either Members of the *Catholick Church*, nor avails any thing to their Salvation.

In which Answer, Two Things will be very difficult to be made out. *First*, How a Priest, who doth not own the Church of *Rome*, but looks upon it as a Superstitious and Idolatrous Church, and that 'tis not lawful to Communicate with it, and by being Excommunicated is become like a Heathen or Infidel, can make another a Member of that Church to which he bears no Relation; 'tis an old Axiom, *Nemo dat id quod non habet*, that no Man can give that which he is not possess'd of; and if a Heretick is not a Member of the Church of *Rome*, how can he make another so? Besides, to the due Administration of the Sacraments, the *Papists* hold the Intention of the Priest absolutely necessary; this is declar'd by the Council of *Trent*, with an *Anathema* upon all who say otherwise, *Sess. 7. Can. 11*. So that if the Priest doth not intend to Baptize, the Person doth not receive Baptism, nor is made a Member of Christ's Church: Now 'tis certain, that those the *Papists* call

call Hereticks do not intend to Baptize into the *Roman Church*, how then can their Baptism make them Members of that Church? *Secondly*, If the Administration of Baptism doth confer even upon Hereticks a true Character of Baptism, why should it not make them Members of the *Catholick Church*? For, what is this true Character which is confer'd by Baptism, but an Actual Admission of them into the Church of Christ.

4. If the *Roman Church* were the same with the *Catholick Church*, then all those Churches who do not yield Subjection to the Bishop of *Rome*, nor acknowledge his Supremacy, are not true Parts of the *Catholick Church*, and by consequence have no possibility of being sav'd; but since this is the Condition of the *Greeks* and *Eastern Churches*, as well as of the Protestants (four of the five *Patriarchal Churches* of the Christian World) we have good reason to believe that God will be more merciful than our Brethren of the Church of *Rome*, and that the *Catholick Church* doth extend farther, and hath larger Bounds than the *Roman*.

This Argument *N. C.* grants is founded on a very great Inconveniency; and so great, that every good Man will be very apt to conclude, both from the Goodness and Mercifulness of God's Nature, that he will

will not damn so great a Multitude of Men, only because they are *Anathamatiz'd* by the Bishop of *Rome*, especially since *N. C.* has formerly told us, That they may be Excommunicated by the Bishop of *Rome*, and yet remain Members of the *Catholick Church*. *N. C.* indeed is very positive, that they cannot be sav'd, and tells us 'tis the Opinion of the *Romish Church*; but from this uncharitable Judgment of theirs, we have good reason to infer, That the Church of *Rome* is so far from being the whole *Catholick Church*, that it is only a very arrogant and uncharitable part of it.

5. If the *Roman Church* was the same with the *Catholick Church*, then it would have been thus express'd in the Ancient Creeds, because it is of so great importance to the Salvation of Mens Souls, and the Peace and Unity of the Church, that it would not have been omitted. But we do not find any Foot-steps of this Expression; nor is this Phrase *The Holy Catholick Church* thus explain'd in the first Ages of the Church. And *Æneas Sylvius* (who was afterwards Pope) tells us, that before the Council of *Nice*, little respect was had to the *Roman Church*; 'tis true, his Grace remarks, that this was said before *Æneas Sylvius* was Pope, but that 'twas never the less true for all that.

To

To this N. C. answers, That tho' the words *Roman Catholick Church* are not to be found in the Ancient Creeds, yet the thing meant by these words is there, because *Roman Catholick Church* and *Holy Catholick Church* do denote the same thing, and are Words of the same importance: But this is a shameful begging of the Question; for the thing in dispute is, Whether the *Catholick Church* in the Creed is the same with the *Roman Church*? and because N. C. cannot prove it, he is pleas'd to suppose it. Such arguing as this he learn'd from his Friend Mr. Serjeant. If a Rule is a Rule, then a Rule is a Rule. And the *Roman Church* is the same ~~same~~ with the *Catholick Church*, therefore the *Roman* is the *Catholick Church*. As to the Authority of *Æneas Sylvius*, N. C. tells us, That the words of *Æneas Sylvius* relate only to the Diocese of Rome. " For (says he) I am sure he never
 " said or writ, that the *Romish Church*,
 " as it includes all the *Christian Churches*
 " in Communion with the See of Rome,
 " (in which sense the Doctor could not
 " be ignorant we always take it) was
 " not the true *Catholick Church*.

In which words he plainly contradicts himself, for he tells us that the Papists always take the *Roman Church* for all *Christian Churches* in Communion with the Church

Church of *Rome*, and in no other sense; and yet in the same breath he gives us another sense of the words, and tells us that *Æneas Sylvius* meant them only of the Diocese of *Rome*. But let us suppose that *Æneas Sylvius* did speak of the Diocese of *Rome*. What then, certainly it must from thence follow, that if little Respect was had to the Diocese of *Rome* before the Council of *Nice*, therefore 'tis not likely that by the *Roman Church* the *Catholick Church* was denoted, the *Roman Church* being only a small, and no remarkable part of it.

As to that Quotation out of *Irenæus*, whereby he endeavours to weaken the Authority of *Æneas Sylvius*, to wit, That every Church must have recourse to this, by reason of her more powerful Principality. The words plainly relate to the Civil Government, and prove that the See of *Rome* had no Advantage over those Sees which were plac'd in other Cities, from any Power deriv'd from Christ which was purely Spiritual; but only because the Civil Power had plac'd there its Residence and Tribunal.

Lastly, The *Roman Church* is not the *Catholick Church*, because our Saviour never constituted *St. Peter* and his Successors supream Head and Pastor of the whole *Christian Church*. Which brings me
to

to the second Point in debate, to prove,

2. That the *Pope* is not the *Supream Head of the Church*.

N. C. tells us, that *the Pope or Bishop of Rome is the Successor of St. Peter, and as such, is the Head of the Church; i.e. not only the Centre of Catholick Unity, as he sometimes explains it; but also by Divine Appointment, the Supream and Universal Pastor of the Christian Church; to whose Jurisdiction every Humane Creature must be subject, on Pain of Eternal Damnation.*

This is an unsufferable Branch of the *Papal Usurpation*, over all Christian Churches in the World, without the least Ground or Colour of Ground, either from Scripture or Antiquity; and may and has been extended, to a Temporal Power over all Princes and Magistrates, under the subtle Pretence of Acting in order to Spiritual Ends.

But that the Bishop of *Rome*, as Successor of *St. Peter*, cannot be the *Supream and Universal Pastor* of Christ's Church, the Archbishop proves;

1. Because there is not the least mention of this in Scripture, (*i. e.*) That *St. Peter* was the *Supream and Universal Pastor* of Christ's Church.

2. Supposing this, yet it doth not thence necessarily follow, that this Power should be derived down from *St. Peter* to the Pope of *Rome*.

1. There

1. There is not the least mention in Scripture of St. Peter's being *the Supream and Universal Pastor* of Christ's Church; there is not the least Intimation of any such thing in the *Gospel*, or the *Acts* and *Epistles* of the Apostles; nay, there is clear Evidence to the contrary, that in the Council at *Jerusalem*, St. James was, if not superior, yet at least equal to him; and S. Paul withstood him to the Face, and plainly asserts the Equality of his own Authority with his.

To this N. C. answers, That 'tis true, that the Scriptures make no mention of this Title, *Supream and Universal Pastor*, in exprefs Words, yet the Archbishop *has no reason to quarrel with them*; because there is nothing more meant by them, but that the Pope is *Head of the Church*.

But this is meer trifling; for 'tis not the Words or Title of *Supream and Universal Pastor*, which the Archbishop dislikes, but the Thing intended by them; and denies that St. Peter was this *Supream and Universal Pastor*; or that the Scripture gives any Intimation that he was the *Head of the Church*: So that what he says of the word *Consubstantial* in the *Nicene Council*, is nothing at all to the Purpose.

But he tells us, that there are Texts of Scripture which prove clearly, that St. Peter was constituted by Christ *Supream*

pream Head of the Church; he quotes *Matth. 16. 18. I say unto thee, thou art Peter (or as the Greek has it, a Rock) and upon this Rock will I build my Church*: As also that our Saviour said unto him, *1 John 21. 15, 16. Feed my Lambs, and feed my Sheep*; by the one he will have the People design'd, by the other the Pastors of the Church. And *Luke 22. 31, 32. When thou art Converted, strengthen or confirm thy Brethren*. These Texts of Scripture (he concludes) must needs denote some particular Mark or Character impress'd upon *St. Peter*, and some Authority and Jurisdiction vested in him above the rest of the Apostles.

This is easily said indeed, but not so soon prov'd; for 'tis evident, that there is nothing here said to *St. Peter*, but what is applicable to all the rest of the Apostles; they are all enjoin'd to *feed God's Lambs and God's Sheep*; both the strong and the weak in Faith; they are all exhorted to confirm and *strengthen one another*; and there is so little Umbrage in the Holy Scripture of any Superiority given to one above the rest, that our Saviour gives the Mother of *Zebedee's Children* a severe Check, for making this Request, *that her Sons might sit the one on the right Hand, and the other on his left, in his Kingdom*: This certainly had been a fit

a fit opportunity for our Saviour to declare to whom this Right did belong, but he blames their Ambition and Arrogancy, and tells them plainly, that he who would be uppermost should be a Servant to the rest.

But because the Papists draw the most plausible Arguments, and rely chiefly for the Proof of *St. Peter's Supremacy* from that Text, *Matth. 16. 18. Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock I will build my Church*: I will therefore consider it more particularly.

And, *First*, This Promise of our Saviour to *St. Peter*, is generally thought to relate to *St. Peter's Confession*; for when our Saviour asked his Disciples, *But whom say ye that I am?* ver. 15. *Peter* immediately answered, *Thou art Christ the Son of the Living God. And Jesus answered and said unto him, Blessed art thou Simon Barjona, for Flesh and Blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in Heaven: And I say unto thee, Thou art Peter, (i. e. thy Name signifies a Stone), and upon that great and fundamental Truth which thou hast made Confession of, (viz. that I am Christ, the Son of the Living God) I will build my Church, and the Gates of Hell shall not prevail against it; i. e. against that Church, which by the Ministry of St. Pe-*
C
ter,

ter, and the rest of the Apostles, was to be built upon this Fundamental Article of Faith ; and that this is the true meaning of the Words, will be more clear by comparing them with *Ephes. 2. 19.* where the same Metaphor of a Building is made use of, to which the Church is compar'd, and the Apostles and Prophets to the Foundation, *Jesus Christ* himself to the chief Corner-stone.

no But suppose these Words were spoke to St. Peter himself, all that can be infer'd from it is, That Christ would so build his Church upon that Apostle, that he should have the Honour of laying its Foundation, both amongst the *Jews* and amongst the *Gentiles* ; not that he should be the *Supream Head and Governour* of it when built, which can never with any shew of Reason, be imply'd in the Promise of Christ of *building his Church upon this Rock* ; for 'tis evident that none of the Apostles, nor St. Peter himself did understand this Promise of any Primacy of Power or Jurisdiction ; because after our Saviour had said these Words, and after they had received the Effusion of the Holy Ghost, which led them into all Truth, and inspir'd them with the full Understanding of Christ's Words ; they did not believe there was any such Primacy given to St. Peter above the rest of the Apostles,

Apostles, but contended who should be greatest.

Secondly, He argues, that the *Evangelists* repeating the Names of the Twelve Apostles, place *St. Peter* first, and particularly mark his Supremacy. Now the Names of the Twelve Apostles are these, the first *Simon, who is called Peter*; and thence N. C. concludes, that there could be no other Reason why he was nam'd first (being he was neither the first Disciple who was call'd, nor the oldest Man) but because the Supremacy was vested in him; and adds, that most certainly Christ did not design the *πρωτος* *Pēlēos*, those words, *first Peter*, for a Primacy of Ceremony and Civility, but for that of Order and Jurisdiction.

But where the Strength of this Argument lies (which he utters with so much confidence) I cannot find; for, how doth it follow, That because *St. Peter* was nam'd first, therefore he had the Rule and Jurisdiction over the rest of the Apostles? The utmost that can be concluded from the naming *St. Peter* in the first place, is; that he had the Precedency of the rest of the Apostles, for some Reason or other; but what that Reason was, is not hereby determin'd. But in truth, we cannot conclude from hence so much as this; for tho' *St. Peter* is here nam'd first,

yet he is not always so, for *Gal. 2. 9.* he is nam'd in the second place.

3. But *N. C.* insists farther, That after Christ's Ascension, *St. Peter* actually took upon himself the Character of *Supream Head of the Church*; and this he endeavours to prove from the First of the *Acts*, where *St. Peter* stood up, and discours'd at large of the Fall of *Judas*: 2. When he gave an account of the Gift of Tongues: 3. When he made his Defence before the Rulers: 4. When he pass'd Sentence upon *Ananias* and *Saphira*, but especially by what he did in that famous Council of the Apostles, *chap. 15.*

These Instances indeed prove *St. Peter* to be an Eminent Apostle, but do not give us the least hint of his Superiority or Jurisdiction over the rest of the Apostles; for in the Council at *Jerusalem*, *St. James* was, if not superior, at least equal to him; and *St. Paul* himself tells us, That he withstood him to the Face, that *St. Peter* gave him the right Hand of Fellowship; and we are told, *Acts 8. 14.* That *St. Peter* and *St. John* were sent by the Apostles, who were at *Jerusalem*, to *Samaria*, which gives no encouragement to the notion of *St. Peter's* Supremacy.

To this *N. C.* replies, "That 'tis true
 " *St. Paul* was equal to *St. Peter*, and so is
 " every Bishop to the Pope; but that this
 " equality

“equality doth consist only in the Power
 “of Preaching the Word, of Administring
 “the Sacraments, and of conferring Holy
 “Orders, but that the supream Govern-
 “ment of the Church was entirely lodg’d
 “in *St. Peter*. This he says indeed, but
 how doth he prove it? Why, after his
 usual manner, by taking it for granted,
 without affording us the least shadow of
 Reason for it.

But since he thinks fit to take it for
 granted, we will pay so much deference
 to him for the present, as to do so too,
 and suppose that *St. Peter* was Bishop of
Rome, and *supream Head of the Church*.
 But then he will be hard put to it to
 prove, that he transmitted his *Supre-*
macy to his Successors, and to his Suc-
 cessors at *Rome*, rather than to those at
Antioch, where ’tis evident that he was
 first Bishop, but not that he was ever
 Bishop of *Rome*. For, if *St. Peter* de-
 volv’d his *Supremacy* upon his immediate
 Successor, and that it is self-evident by
 the Law of Nature, that Heirs and Suc-
 cessors inherit the Privileges of their An-
 cessors, as he tells us, *pag. 102.* then his
 immediate Successor at *Antioch*, where he
 was first Bishop, must be the *Supream Head*
and Pastor of the Church; and then the *Su-*
premacy will be lodg’d in the Church of
Antioch, and not in the See of *Rome*.

To this *N.C.* answers, That 'tis true, that the Holy Scripture no where declares, that *St. Peter's Supremacy*, was derived down to his Successor at *Rome*, and that it was not necessary it should be so declar'd; because the Power and Authority of a Bishop naturally devolves upon his Successor; and with his usual Modesty and Civility tells us, " That this
 " Question of *His Grace* (*viz.* Where does
 " it appear in Scripture, that *St. Peter's*
 " Power was deriv'd to his Successors?)
 " is one of the simplest Expressions that
 " ever fell from a Man of his Parts; and
 " and that he is almost unwilling to honour it with a Confutation. But since he acknowledges *His Grace* to be an *Ingenious Person*, and a *Man of Parts*, I am apt to think he had some good Reason for what he said; tho' a Man of *N.C.'s* Parts and Ingenuity cannot presently apprehend it. Now since there are three sorts of *Supremacy*; a *Supremacy* of Worth, Order, and Jurisdiction; why may not *St. Peter's Supremacy* be the first and second of these? Which being founded on Personal Merit, doth not naturally flow to the immediate Successor? That it was so, is more than probable, because there is not the least Footstep of any *Supremacy* of Jurisdiction lodg'd in *St. Peter*, either in the Holy Writ, or in any of the Antient Monuments
 of

of the Church for the first five Centuries; and when the Title of *Universal Bishop* was usurp'd by the Patriarch of *Constantinople*, in the end of the sixth Century, it was look'd upon as a new and profane Title. But the Archbishop asks another Question; Why, (supposing that *S. Peter's Supremacy* did descend to his immediate Successor) the Supremacy should be fix'd to the See of *Rome*? Because 'tis uncertain whether *St. Peter* was ever Bishop of *Rome*; and if we grant that too, yet 'tis evident that he was first Bishop of *Antioch*: And when the Papists themselves confess, that *St. Peter* rais'd two Episcopal Sees, the first at *Antioch*, the other at *Rome*, why should all Power and Jurisdiction be entail'd upon the See of *Rome*, and none descend to his immediate Successor at *Antioch*? This Objection *N. C.* took notice of, but is not pleas'd to honour it with an Answer.

And now since the Missionaries of the Church of *Rome* make use of this Sovereignty and Supremacy of the *Pope*, to prove the Infallibility of his Person; by shewing how little Reason there is to submit to his Supremacy, the way is level'd and prepar'd in order to attack that great Bulwark of Popery, the *Infallibility*; and to shew, That neither the *Pope*, nor Church

of Rome, are *Infalible*. And this the Archbishop proves;

1. Because the *Papists* are not agreed amongst themselves, where this *Infalibility* is seated, whether in the *Pope* alone, or a *Council* alone, or in both together, or in the diffusive Body of Christians; and we cannot judge it reasonable that the Christians in all Ages did believe it, and had constant recourse to it, for determining their Differences; and yet that That very Church, which hath enjoy'd and us'd it so long, should now be at a loss where to find it; nothing could have fall'n out more unluckily, than that there should be such Differences amongst them, about that which they pretend to be the only Means of ending all Differences.

To this N. C.'s Answer is so singular, that I shall transcribe it for the use of the Reader. " For my own Part, (says he) " I never yet read, or heard of any Ca- " tholick Divine, that ever said, That the " Catholick Church, taken for *the Diffu-* " *sive Body of Christians*, was not *infalli-* " *ble* in declaring Matters of Faith; there- " fore, I think, all agree, that the *Infalli-* " *bility* is seated in *the diffusive Body of* " *Christians*: And I challenge any Pro- " testant in the World to name me one, " who says the contrary. The *Pope* is " one, and the chief Member of that Dif- " fusive

“ fusive Body. The *Pope*, and *Council* to-
 “ gether, make a great many Members;
 “ and if you add to these all the rest of
 “ the Faithful, they make up *the entire*
 “ *Diffusive Body of Christians*. If the *Pope*
 “ be *infallible*, surely the concurrence of a
 “ *Council* will rather confirm than dimi-
 “ nish his *Infallibility*; if the *Pope* and
 “ *Council* together be *infallible*, the Con-
 “ sent of the *Diffusive Body of Christians*
 “ must surely strengthen and confirm it;
 “ but if neither the *Pope*, nor the *Council*
 “ alone be *infallible*, the *Diffusive Body of*
 “ *Christians* must necessarily be; if any
 “ such thing as *Infallibility* may be ascrib’d
 “ to any of the Three, seeing both *Pope*
 “ and *Council* are included in it. We are
 “ sure then, the *Infallibility* consists at
 “ least in *the Diffusive Body of Christians*.
 “ But to illustrate this a little more, let
 “ us propose this familiar Example. If I
 “ should ask where my *Lord Mayor* of
 “ *London* is, at this time? And that
 “ some should tell me, he is in his own
 “ House; others, not in his own House,
 “ but somewhere in *London*; and others,
 “ neither in his own House, nor in *Lon-*
 “ *don*, but in *England*: I would willing-
 “ ly know, whether these three sorts of
 “ People do not all agree that my *Lord*
 “ *Mayor* is in *England*? Certainly they
 “ do; because the Assent of the two
 “ for-

“ former is necessarily implied in the
 “ latter.

“ In like manner, tho’ some say the
 “ *Pope is infallible*; others, not the *Pope*
 “ alone, but together with a *General Coun-*
 “ *cil*; and others, neither *Pope* nor *Council*
 “ alone, without the Concurrence of the
 “ *Diffusive Body of Christians*; yet all do
 “ centre in this, that the *Diffusive*
 “ *Body of Christians* is *infallible*. The
 “ Doctor is then very much out, when
 “ he says; *They do not know where it is, tho’*
 “ *they are sure they have it.*

“ In short, the Article of Faith, clearly
 “ known, and unanimously assented to by
 “ all *Roman Catholics*, in regard of *Infal-*
 “ *libility*, is only this: (*viz.*) That the
 “ *Holy Ghost*, the Spirit of Truth, by the
 “ Promise of *Christ*, in all Ages resides in
 “ the *Catholick Church*; *infallibly* declares
 “ and explains, by the Pastors of the
 “ Church assembled in *General Council*,
 “ and united to their Head, all Christian
 “ Verities. In this great Principle of
 “ Faith, all *Roman Catholics* with As-
 “ surance and universal Concord agree;
 “ and herein consists the whole Notion of
 “ what *Roman Catholics* mean by the
 “ Term *Infallible*.

And I think, whoever reads this An-
 swer, must conclude from thence, that the
Papists are not agreed amongst themselves,
 where

where this *Infallibility* is seated; *Therefore they do not know where it is.* 'Tis a plain Question we demand of the *Papists*. If there is appointed by Christ an *infallible* Judge, to decide all Controversies which shall arise about the Christian Faith, Who is he, and where we may address ourselves unto him? To this *N. C.* answers, "That he never yet read or heard of any "*Catholick Divine*, that ever said, that the "*Catholick Church*, taken for the *Diffusive* "*Body of Christians* was not *infallible*, in declaring Matters of Faith. Well then, all the *Catholick Divines* are agreed, that the *Infallibility* doth reside in the *Diffusive Body of Christians*; and we have nothing else to do, but to prove, That the *Diffusive Body of Christians* cannot be *infallible* Judges and Determiners of Controversies; which I think is no difficult matter to perform, because they never did, nor can meet together, nor did they ever determine any one Controversie.

But perhaps his meaning may be, that the *Diffusive Body of Christians* is *infallible*; not as taken personally, but as represented "in a *General Council*, of which the *Pope* is "the Head; and that the Holy Ghost *infallibly* declares and explains by the Pastors "of the Church assembled in a *General Council*, and united to their Head, all "*Christian Verities*. But this doth not agree with

“ with what he has told us, That to make
 “ up *the diffusive Body of Christians*, not only
 “ a General Council united to their Head, but
 “ all the rest of the Faithful are requir’d.
 “ And that several of the *Popish* Divines are
 “ of Opinion, That a General Council with
 “ the Pope at their Head is not *infallible*,
 “ without the concurrence of *the diffusive*
 “ *Body of Christians*: And how to recon-
 cile these Inconsistences, I know not; and
 till they are reconcil’d, I must affirm,
 that not only the *Papists* in general, but
 N. C. in particular, tho’ he may be never
 so confident that the *Roman Church* is *In-*
fallible, knows not where to find this
Infallibility, and then ’twill be of no
 use to him; and if ’tis of no use, I am
 very inclinable to think there is no such
 thing. And as for this Instance of the
Lord Mayor, it labours with this Fallacy;
 That first he supposes such a Magistrate
 in Being; and then he would prove from
 hence, that he must be somewhere; but
 the thing in dispute is, whether there is
 an *Infallible* Judge, or no? and if he is
 not to be met with any where, ’tis very
 reasonable to conclude there is no such
 Person. There are several other Hints in
 this Paragraph which are very dark and
 mysterious, and I should be very glad to
 have them explain’d, and to know how
Infallibility can be strengthened, and made
 more

more certain ; for if it can be so, I am apt to think, that the *Infallibility* the *Papists* boast so much of, will fall short of that *Moral Certainty* we *Protestants* are contented withall : Or, what use he intended to make of that irrefragable Demonstration : “ That supposing *Infallibility* “ is either in the *Pope*, or *Council*, or the “ *diffusive Body of Christians* ; that if it is “ not in either of the two first, it must necessarily be in the last. But leaving these Trifles, the Archbishop argues ;

2. That the Church of *Rome* is not *infallible*, because there is not the least intimation in *Scripture* of this Privilege confer'd upon it. The *Apostles* in all their *Epistles* do not give the least direction to Christians to appeal to the *Bishop of Rome* for a determination of the many Differences, which even in those Times hapned among them : Nay, on the contrary, there are shrewd intimations given, that the Church of *Rome* her self should Apostatize from that Faith, and that her Haughtiness would be her Ruine, *Rom. 11. 20, 21.* where speaking of the *Jews* who were broken off by their Unbelief, he gives this Caution to the Church of *Rome* ; *Well, because of Unbelief, they were broken off, and thou standest by Faith. Be not high-minded, but fear. For, if God spared not the natural Branches, take heed lest he also spare not thee,*

thee. Be not high-minded, but fear. What need they to *fear*, who had the Privilege of *Infallibility*? Their Faith must needs be unshaken: But *St. Paul* seems to think that Church to be in as much danger of falling from the Faith as any other. Neither do the Ancient Fathers in their Disputes with *Hereticks*, appeal to this Judge, tho' it was so short and expedite a way of ending Controversies. And this very Consideration to a Wise Man, is instead of a thousand Arguments, to satisfy him that in those Times no such thing was believed in the World.

To this *N. C.* answers, That those
 “Texts of Scripture which prove the Ro-
 “*man Church* to be the *Catholick Church*,
 “prove also the *Infallibility* of the Church,
 “but those have been already accounted
 “for: Then he affirms, That the *Ancient*
Fathers did appeal to this Judge, and quotes
 a Sentence out of *St. Austin*, which is no-
 thing to this purpose; the Father says,
That he should not believe the Gospel,
but that the Authority of the Church moves
him to it; the true meaning of which is,
 That 'tis by the Authority of the Church,
 that we judge what Books are *Canonical*,
 and what not; and that the true Books
 are distinguish'd from the spurious, by the
 Church giving Testimony that they were
 the genuine Books, written in those
 Times,

Times, by those Persons whose Names they bear ; and then he remits the Reader to *Tertullian*, *St. Austin*, *Epiphanius*, but quotes nothing out of them, which he would certainly have done (being is very liberal of his Quotations out of the Fathers) if the case were so plain as he pretends. he

3. The Archbishop argues farther, that we may as well expect an *Infallible* Judge in Temporal Matters as in Spiritual. The ground of this Argument is this, The *Papists* in defence of their *Infallibility* urge, that an *Infallible* Judge is necessary, because otherwise every particular Man would be left to judge for himself ; and if every Man should judge for himself, there would be nothing but confusion in Religion, there would be no end of Controversies ; so that an Universal, *Infallible* Judge is necessary ; and without this, God had not made sufficient Provision for the assurance of Mens Faith, and for the Peace and Unity of his Church, or as 'tis express'd in the *Canon Law*, *Aliter Dominus non videretur fuisse discretus*, otherwise our Lord had not seem'd to be discreet.

To this *his Grace* answers, That 'tis high Presumption in Men to say, God should do thus or thus ; but they ought rather to consider what he has done, and to lay their
Mouths

Mouths in the Dust, and to admire the Wisdom of his Doings.

Secondly, That if this Argument had any sense in it, it would prove that there ought to be an *Infallible* Judge set over us in Temporal Matters as well as Spiritual, because the one is as necessary to the Peace of the World, as the other to the Peace of the Church; and that Men are every whit as apt to be perverse about Matters of Temporal Right, as about Matters of Faith.

To this N. C. replies, ' That this Life
' is a State of Trial, and that we must *pass*
' thro' much Tribulation into the Kingdom of
' God; and therefore God permits the
' Cruelty of Tyrants to try the Patience
' of Martyrs, and suffers the Oppression of
' the Poor on Earth, to enhance their Re-
' ward in Heaven; so that the Cruelty or
' Errors of a Temporal Judge do rather
' increase, than diminish the Happiness of
' the Just: But that the Case is far other-
' wise in Spiritual Matters; if the Judge
' should spoil us of our Faith, or err in Judg-
' ing for us, it would cause our eternal
' Ruin, our Damnation being necessarily
' consequent upon a false Belief. And for
' that Reason, the Goodness of God seems
' to be so much the more engag'd to secure
' the Spiritual, than the Temporal Judge
' from Error.

In which Reply, N. C. is guilty of several gross Mistakes ; for, *First*, he supposes that every Man must rely upon the Judgment of some Spiritual Judge, and that his Salvation depends upon the Certainty of this his Judgment ; but this we *Protestants* deny, and think that God has much better provided for us, by giving every one liberty to judge for himself. And, *Secondly*, he mistakes the Archbishop's Argument, which is only levell'd against that idle pretence of the *Papists*, *That 'tis very convenient that there should be such an Infallible Judge of Controversies* : To which *his Grace* replies, That 'tis a high Presumption in Man to think, that God must do whatsoever he fancies convenient. And, *Thirdly*, it seems much more convenient that there should be no *Infallible Judge*, because if we were *infallibly* certain of the Articles of our Faith, our Assent to them would be no Virtue, and we should lose that Blessing which is pronounced on those *who have not seen, and yet believe*, because we should be more certain than if we had seen them. N. C. says farther, That Christ threatens eternal Damnation to all those who will not believe his Doctrine, which cannot stand with his infinite Goodness, unless he had provided *infallible Means* of conveying the Truth of this Doctrine to them.

Whereas *his Grace* has often told them, and particularly in his *Preface* to his *First Volume of Sermons*, That there may be such Evidence as no Wise Man may have reason to question, tho' there should be no *Infallibility* at all; and therefore when we have such a *Moral Assurance* of the Truth of these Articles of our Faith which are propos'd to us, we have good reason to be content with this Evidence, and to give our full Assent to it.

Fourthly, *His Grace* argues, That an *Infallible Judge*, if there were one, is no certain way to end Controversies, and and to preserve the Unity of the Church; unless it were likewise *infallibly* certain, that there is such a Judge, and who he is. For till Men are sure of both these, there will still be a Controversie, Who the *Infallible Judge* is, and where to find him. And if it be true which they tell us, *That without an Infallible Judge Controversies can never be ended*, then a Controversie concerning an *Infallible Judge* can never be ended.

To this *N. C.* answers, That he has already prov'd both, that there is an *Infallible Judge*, and who this *Infallible Judge* is.

But, *First*, How has he prov'd that there is an *Infallible Judge*? He pretends to prove it from Reason, and Scripture, and

and the Fathers ; and herein he appeals to the Sense and Reason of every private Person in this great Fundamental Article of the *Popish* Faith ; but this Appeal is contrary to that Principle of the *Papists*, *That an Infallible Judge is necessary to decide all Controversies in Religion*. But says *N. C.* we appeal to the *Church*, which is an *Infallible* Judge ; and the *Church* tells us, both that there is an *Infallible* Judge, and that the *Church* is that *Infallible* Judge : But this is to suppose the thing in Controversie, not to prove it ; and besides, since they are not agreed amongst themselves what they mean by that *Church*, which is to be the *Infallible* Judge of all Controversies, 'tis evident, that this Controversie can never be ended till they find out some other *Infallible* Judge to decide it. Let them therefore first agree amongst themselves what they mean by that *Church*, which is to be the *Infallible* Judge of Controversies, whether the *Pope*, or the *Pope in Council*, or the *Pope in Council*, together with the *diffusive Body of Christians* ; before they send us to this *Church*, to have our Differences decided by it.

Fifthly, The Archbishop argues, That if God had thought it necessary that there should be an *Infallible Church*, in the Communion whereof every Man may be secur'd from the dangers of a wrong Be-

lief, he would have revealed this very thing more plainly than any particular Point of Faith whatsoever. He would have told us expressly, and in the plainest terms, that he had appointed an *Infalible* Guide and Judge in Matters of Faith, and would have likewise as plainly told us who he was, and where we might find him, and have recourse to him on all occasions.

To this *N. C.* answers, That the *Soci-nians* may retort this Argument upon us, and say, ‘ That if God had thought the knowledge of the three Persons really distinct, each of them perfect God, and yet but one God, necessary to be believ’d by the Faithful, he would have revealed this very thing more plainly than any particular Point whatsoever, because it is look’d upon to be the chiefest *Mystery* of Christianity.

But here *N. C.* is mistaken in several Particulars. For all that we are oblig’d to assent to in the *Mystery* of the *Trinity*, which is necessary to Salvation, is as plainly reveal’d in the Holy Scriptures as the Matter will bear, and that it is not more plainly reveal’d is only owing to the Weakness of our Intellect, which in this Life is not capable of comprehending it; plain Truths are plainly revealed in the Holy Scripture, but *Mysteries* only so far

far as they have an Influence upon our Practice, and after all the Explications of them, they will remain *mysterious* still. Thus we are told in the Holy Scripture, that there is One God, and Three distinct Persons in the Godhead; because this is necessary to understand the Oeconomy of our Salvation, and the different Operations of the Godhead in the Wonderful Work of Man's Redemption: But the Manner of the Subsistence of the *Trinity*, is still a *Mystery*, and will continue so, *till Faith shall end in Vision*: Nay 'tis very questionable, whether in Heaven itself we shall be capable of comprehending it. And therefore since this is one of the most Adorable *Mysteries* in Christianity, there is no Reason why we should endeavour to comprehend the Manner of it; but very good Reason why we should not. But the Doctrine of the *Infallibility* is of a different nature; for the End of constituting an *infallible* Judge must be, To determine such Controversies as arise about Religious Matters. Now, this End is wholly evacuated, unless it evidently appears not only that there is such a Judge, but who this Judge is; nay unless there is such a plain Revelation of it, that even *Schismatics* and *Hereticks* may be *infallibly* convinc'd who this Judge is: For since N. C. defines the Church to consist only

of such Members who agree in one Faith, there is no need of such a Judge for those who are already agreed, but only for those that differ; and as he tells us before, *when the Faith is violated by Schismatics and Hereticks*. 'Tis therefore a sufficient Ground of our Assent to this Article of our Faith; That in the Godhead there is a *Trinity in Unity*, to prove from Scripture, that every distinct Person is God, and that yet there is but one God; and we ought to be content to be ignorant of the Manner how it is so; tho' 'tis but reasonable that many other Truths in the Holy Scriptures should be more fully explain'd to us, because they lie more level to our Capacities and Understandings.

As to those Texts of Scriptures which he instances in, and tells us, that they plainly prove, that the Church is *infallible*; they are nothing at all to the purpose, but prove rather the direct contrary.

The First is, *Tell the Church, and if he will not hear the Church, let him be to thee as a Heathen or Publican*, Matth. 18. 16, 17. But this Text plainly relates to such Private Injuries as arise between Man and Man, and direct us how to compose them, and right our selves, without returning or revenging them; as will plainly appear, by considering the Scope of the Place,

Place ; and the Coherence of the Words, with those which went before.

John 1. 13. *When he the Spirit of Truth cometh, he will guide you into all Truth ;* this Promise is evidently made to the Apostles only, who were *infallibly* guided into all Truth : But if we should grant that it was made to the whole Church, it doth not follow, the Church should always be *infallible* ; no more than it follows, that we should be defended from all Sin ; because we have a Promise of being led into all Good.

Matth. 28. 20. *Lo I am with you always, to the end of the World ;* and *1 Tim.* 3. 15. *The Pillar and Ground of Truth ;* the first mentions nothing of the Church's *Infallibility*, and doth not prove any such thing ; for God may many ways assist and direct his Church, without making it *infallible* : The other is a Metaphorical Expression, and too weak a Foundation to build any Doctrine upon , especially that weighty Point of the *Infallibility*.

I have been the shorter in my Explication of these Texts of Scripture , because 'tis contrary to the Principles which the *Papists* hold , to found this Doctrine upon the Authority of the Holy Scripture : For as *'His Grace* tells us , They hold, ' that the *Infallibility* of the Church must first be known and prov'd, before we can

' either know the Scriptures , or the Sence
 ' of them ; and yet, till we know the Scri-
 ' ptures and the Sence of them, nothing
 ' can be prov'd by them. Now to pretend
 ' to prove the *Infallibility* of their Church
 ' by Scripture ; and at the same time to de-
 ' clare, that to know which are the true
 ' Books of Scripture, and which is the
 ' true Sence of them, can only be prov'd
 ' by the *infallible* Authority of their Church,
 ' is a plain and shameful *Circle* , out of
 ' which there is no way of escape ; and
 ' consequently, that God hath appointed an
 ' *infallible* Church, is impossible ever to be
 ' prov'd from Scripture, according to their
 ' Principles, and the thing is capable of no
 ' other Proof. For that God will *infallibly*
 ' assist any Society of Men , is not to be
 ' known, but by Divine Revelation ; so that
 ' unless they can prove it by some other
 ' Revelation, the thing is not to be prov'd
 ' at all.

Sixthly, We have as much need of *in-*
fallible Security against Sin and Vice in
 Matters of Practice, as against Errors in
 Matters of Faith. For since a right Be-
 lief is only in order to a good Life, a
 Man would be hard put to it, to give a
 Wise Reason, why God should take
 greater Care of Men's Faith, than of their
 Obedience.

To

' To this N. C. answers, That every
 ' good Christian is infallibly secur'd against
 ' Sin, by the Assistance of God's Grace;
 ' and that the Assistance of God's Grace,
 ' together with the Co-operation of our
 ' Wills, which is always in our Power, is an
 ' *infallible* Security against Sin, if put in
 use. But how contrary this is both to the
 Holy Scripture, and our own Experience,
 let any one judge. Doth not the Holy
 Scripture teach us, that *there is none that*
doth good, no not one, Rom. 3. 22. that
the most just Man falleth seven times a day;
 and that *our Righteousness, our most holy and*
devout Performances, are but as filthy rags?
 Isa. 64. 6. Is not this the Tenor of the
 Gospel-Covenant, *That if we repent of*
our Sins, he is faithful and just to forgive
us our Sins, and to cleanse us from all Un-
righteousness? 1 John 1. And therefore as
 under the Gospel God doth not exact a
 Perfect Obedience from us, but has en-
 join'd us to serve him sincerely and
 heartily; and to repent, and be truly
 sorry for our involuntary Transgressions,
 our Sins of Ignorance and Infirmary: So
 God has so far secur'd us from Error, that
 we shall not fall into any Damnable Do-
 ctrine, if we read the Holy Scriptures with
 an attentive Mind, and an honest Heart,
 and use our utmost Endeavour to under-
 stand them: But as the Weakness and
 Frail-

Frailty of our Condition is such, that we have no *infallible* Security against Sin and Vice; so neither is there any against Error. It is sufficient, that in both respects he hath done that which is sufficient to make us capable of Happiness, if we are not wanting to our selves: The rest he hath left to the Sincerity of our Endeavours; expecting that we, on our Part should *work out our Salvation with fear and trembling, and give all diligence to make our Calling and Election sure.*

Lastly, Since all things necessary, either in Faith or Practice, are clearly and plainly revealed in the Holy Scripture; therefore there is no need of an *Infallible* Church: This is so plainly prov'd in the four first Sermons of the third Volume of the Archbishop's Sermons, (*edit. post ob.*) that N. C. doth not think fit to say any thing in Confutation of it; but only tells us, that in establishing this Principle, (which as he truly says, is the Fundamental Principle of *Protestants*, and can never be mov'd by all the *Papists* in the World) the Archbishop does two things, he would not willingly allow of: That First, He makes any Man of sense, who can read the Scripture, as *infallible* as the whole *Catholick Church* (he means the *Roman*) pretends to be. Secondly, He justifies in a great measure, all the *Hereticks* that

that ever denied any Points of Faith, on Pretence that they are not plain Scripture. This is indeed a heavy Charge, let us see how he maintains it. First, He says, the Archbishop makes any Man of sense, that can read the Scripture, as *Infallible* as the whole *Catholick Church* (i. e. the *Church of Rome*) pretends to be. For, ' says he, the *Catholick Church* pretends ' only to be *Infallible* in necessary Articles ' of Faith. Now if all things necessary to ' be known in Faith and Practice, be clear ' and plain in Scripture; then there is no ' Man of sense that reads it, but may be ' as *infallible* in what is clear and plain, as ' any Church or Churches in the World: ' For what is clear and plain to a Man, he is ' as sure and certain of, as if all the Mathe- ' maticians in the World had demonstrated ' it unto him. So that this worthy and grave ' Doctor necessarily vests in every Private ' Man that *Infallibility*, which he endea- ' vours with so much earnestness to deny ' to the whole *Catholick Church*.

Thus N. C. argues, or rather he makes use of so many wilful Prevarications, that there is hardly one Sentence, that doth not include some Falsity in it. For says he, the *Catholick Church* only pretends to be *infallible* in the necessary Articles of Faith; but is there any such Limitation as this in the Definition of *Infallibility*?

Doth

Doth he not say, *That the Church cannot err in Delivering the Doctrines she received from Christ, nor mistake in the Explanation of it?* And will he say, that by Doctrines he means only such as are absolutely necessary to Salvation; such as are contain'd in the written Word of God? And doth he not know, that the *Roman Church* lays claim to a Power of declaring what Doctrines are necessary, and what not? And so can call what Doctrines she pleases Necessary, tho' of never so little Importance, as many of those Twelve Articles are, which the *Pope* has added to the *Apostles Creed*; as also that he lays claim to a power of Explaining all those Articles; whereby many New Tenents are introduc'd into the Church, and declar'd to be absolutely necessary to be believ'd in order to Eternal Salvation, which have no manner of Foundation in the Holy Writ. 2dly, He cannot be ignorant that the Archbishop means a *Moral Assurance*, and not an *Absolute Infallibility*; because he has declared it so plainly in many of his Sermons, and inculcated it so often; and yet N.C. is resolved to mistake his Meaning, and to affirm, That the Archbishop places the same *Infallibility* in every Private Person, which the *Papists* affirm to be vested in the

the *Church of Rome*. Whereas the *His Grace* only says, that every Private Person, by the constant and diligent Study of the Holy Scripture, may attain to so much Knowledge, as may inform him what he ought to believe, and what he ought to do; and suffice to lead him unto Life Everlasting. 3^{dly}, He cannot but know that we may have a *Moral Certainty* of many things, for which we have no Demonstration: All these things *N. C.* could not be ignorant of, tho' he was resolved to shut his Eyes, and seem not to apprehend them. By which we may see, what Shifts those Persons are put to, who have undertaken to lay false Colours upon a bad Cause, and to place their counterfeit Wares in a false Light, in order to put them off to some unwary or unskillful Chapman.

2. He says, the Archbishop justifies all Hereticks that ever deny'd any Points of Faith, on pretence that they are not plain in Scripture; and particularly he instances in the *Socinians*, who, he tells us, have got the better of the *Protestants*, and beat them at their own Weapons.

But first 'tis evident, that *N. C.* is no competent Judge which has got the better, because he doth not pretend to be a Judge of the meaning of those Texts of Scripture which give occasion to the Disputes. Nor doth the Abuse of the *Holy Scriptures*

Scriptures put in any Bar against the use of them ; Mens Lusts, and Passions, and Prejudices, will blind their Understandings, and clap a Bias upon their Judgments : And tho' the Truths of Religion are never so plain, and clearly revealed to them, yet will not they afford them their Assent : Those Men who will not practice those Duties, which are evident even by the Light of Nature, will misapply the plainest Texts of Scripture, when they deliver any thing contrary to their corrupt Inclination. But this is not the fault of the Rule, but of the Men who misapply it ; who would continue the same Infidels or Hereticks, tho' they had an *Infallible* Judge to dictate to them : for we find, there were never more *Heresies* than in the Times of the Apostles ; and yet 'tis confess'd on all hands, that they were endow'd with an *Infallible* Spirit.

I might add a great deal more on this Argument, but I fear I have dwelt too long on it already ; and therefore I must desire the Reader, who is not satisfied with what is here said, to review the Archbishop's Sermons, where he will find many more excellent Arguments to the same purpose. I shall sum up all with an ingenious Apologue, from the 99th Page of the *Third Volume of Sermons*.

I will

I will conclude (says *his Grace*) with a very plain and familiar Case, by which it will appear what Credit and Authority is fit to be given to a *Guide*, and what not. Suppose I came a Stranger into *England*, and landing at *Dover*, took a *Guide* there to conduct me in my way to *Tork*, which I know before by the *Map* to lie *North* of *Dover*; having committed my self to him, if he led me for two or three days together out of the plain Road, and many times over Hedge and Ditch, I cannot but think it strange, that in a civil and well-inhabited Country, there should be no High Ways from one part of it to another: Yet thus far I submit to him, tho' not without some regret and impatience. But then if after this, for two or three days more he led me directly *South*, and with my Face full upon the Sun at Noon-day, and at last bring me back again to *Dover* Peer, and still bid me follow him; then certainly no Modesty doth oblige a Man not to dispute with his *Guide*, and to tell him, surely that can be no Way, because it is Sea. Now tho' he set never so bold a Face upon the Matter, and tell me with all the Gravity and Authority in the World, That it is not the Sea, but dry Land, under the *Species* and *Appearance* of Water; and that whatever my Eyes tell me, having once committed my self to
his

his Guidance, I must not trust my own Senses in the case ; it being one of the most dangerous sorts of Infidelity for a Man to believe his own Eyes, rather than his faithful and *infallible Guide* : All this moves me not ; but I begin to expostulate roundly with him, and to let him understand, that if I must not believe what I see, he is like to be of no farther use to me, because I shall not be able at this rate to know whether I have a Guide, and whether I follow him or not. In short, I tell him plainly, that when I took him for my Guide, I did not take him to tell me the difference between *North* and *South*, between a *Hedge* and a *High-Way*, between *Sea* and *dry Land* ; all this I knew before, as well as he or any Man else could tell me ; but I took him to conduct me the directest way to *York* : And therefore, after all his impertinent Talk, after all his Motives of Credibility to persuade me to believe him, and all his confident Sayings, which he gravely calls Demonstrations, I stand stily upon the Shoar, and leave my Learned and Reverend *Guide* to take his own course, and to dispose of himself as he pleaseth, but firmly resolv'd not to follow him : And is any Man to be blam'd who treats with his *Guide* on these Terms ?

And

And this is truly the case, when a Man commits himself to the *Guidance* of any Person or Church; if by virtue of this Authority, they will needs persuade me out of my Senses, and not to believe what I see, but what they say, *that Virtue is Vice, and Vice Virtue, if they declare them to be so*: And that because they say they are *Infallible*, I am to receive all their Dictates for *Oracles*, tho' never so evidently false and absurd in the Judgment of all Mankind. In this case there is no way to be rid of these unreasonable People, but to desire of them, since one Kindness deserves another, and all Contradictions are alike easie to be believ'd, that they would be pleased to believe, that Infidelity is Faith; and that when I absolutely renounce their Authority, I do yield a most perfect Submission and Obedience to it.

Of Transubstantiation.

WHAT the *Papists* hold to be of Faith concerning this Point, *N. C.* tell us, is this, “ That the whole
 “ Substance of the Bread and Wine, is after
 “ Consecration, chang’d into the Body
 “ and Blood of Christ, without any al-
 “ teration of the Accidents or outward
 “ Forms.

Against this impious and absurd Tenent, *his Grace* has very frequently, all along his Sermons, taken care to fence his Hearers, and has writ a just Treatise, and inserted it in his *Third Volume of Sermons*, to prove that this Doctrine of *Transubstantiation* is directly contrary to Sense and Reason, and the common Notions of Mankind; and that it has no Revelation to uphold it, nor was it ever thought on in the first and purest Ages of the Church, and that ’tis chiefly upheld by the interest of the *Roman Clergy*, and the uncommon assurance of those who assert it; and this he has perform’d with that Strength of Argument, and Plainness and Clearness of Stile, which was natural to him; and which has in a great measure exhausted the Subject.

To

To the Archbishop's Arguments, N. C. pretends to return an Answer, and with some shew of Reason and Philosophy, and Quotations out of the Fathers and the Holy Scripture; and (as usually) is very positive in his Assertions; tho' in truth, he doth but nibble ^{at} an Argument, and says little to the purpose; so that *those strong Reasons which his Grace has brought forth*, (like an Arch'd Building) stand more firm and secure for the weak Efforts he has made against them. And therefore, tho' the bare reading over the Archbishop's Treatise, by any intelligent and well dispos'd Person, would be a sufficient Answer to N. C's Cavils; yet since he has made use of some *untemper'd Mortar*, to repair the Ruins, and fill up the Chinks of this mysterious Edifice (as he calls it) and labours to prop up the rotten Materials and visible Decays of this tottering Fabrick; I shall therefore take the pains to consider what he has to say on this Subject.

And, First, N. C. begins with a heavy Complaint against the Archbishop, for treating the *Papists* with scurrilous and abusive Language; but does it in such terms, that no one would ever have thought that N. C. and the Author of *the True and Modest Account*, were the same Person; for tho' *His Grace* doth

sometimes expose the Follies of the *Church of Rome*, and is pleasant at such times, when the Matter doth not require a serious Answer. But as *Horace* advises,

——— *Ridiculum acri*
Fortius & melius magnas plerunque se-
cat res.

Yet he never departs from that becoming and good-natur'd Gravity, which was in a peculiar manner his Character and Ornament. And therefore N. C. has only expos'd himself, when he begins his Discourse with this insipid Harangue, which I shall transcribe, to give the Reader a taste of his Sincerity and Temper.

“ Never, says he, *Roman Conqueror*
 “ sung more *Pæans* after Victory, nor in-
 “ sulted over his Enemy with more
 “ Ostentation, than *Dr. Tillotson* has, on
 “ this Subject, over the *Roman Catholicks*
 “ and the *Church of Rome*; and (to com-
 “ pleat the Parallel) if his railing Elo-
 “ quence and unchristian Contumelies
 “ (I am sorry he extorts such Words from
 “ me) were of equal force to bind, with
 “ that of *Roman Chains*, no barbarous
 “ Captives were ever worse us'd by their
 “ insulting Conquerors, than the Sons of
 “ that Mother, whose Piety and Zeal,
 “ brought forth in Christ, his Ancestors,
 “ have

“ have the fortune to be treated by the
 “ unchristian Slanders and Calumnies of
 “ his bitter Tongue and Pen. Besides
 “ that invincible Argument (if we believe
 “ him) that *Achilles, the Evidence of*
 “ *Sense*, which he pretends to be against
 “ this Mystery, and which he repeats
 “ over and over, in more places of his
 “ Sermons than I can at present reckon;
 “ he has oblig’d us with a Treatise writ-
 “ ten on purpose upon this Subject,
 “ which he calls *a Discourse against Tran-*
 “ *substantiation*: In this Piece I meet
 “ with as copious a Collection of scurri-
 “ lous, injurious Language, of notorious
 “ and manifold Impositions, and so much
 “ Disingenuity in citing of Authors, and
 “ managing their Authorities, as I be-
 “ lieve, was ever possible for any Man,
 “ who had never so little esteem for his
 “ Credit, to bring within so narrow a
 “ compass.

This is so heavy a Charge, and of so
 venomous a Nature, considering the Crimes
 objected, and the Dignity and Worth of
 the Person, against whom it is levell’d,
 that if N. C. cannot make plain proof of
 it, he must pass amongst all Men of com-
 mon Honesty and Sense, for a bare-fac’d
 and infamous Calumniator. I should be
 glad he had any thing to say to excuse
 himself, and should have had the charity

to believe, that Zeal for the great *Diana* of the *Popish* Religion, or Passion which is *brevis Furor*, might have transported him into these Indecencies, and occasion'd the casting up so much Dirt and Filth upon his Superiours; but that he takes care to inform his Reader, that he was calm and serene when he wrote it, and *in no Passion*: And therefore he has the more to answer for, and ought himself to consider what he so frequently admonishes the Archbishop of, *That he must shortly give an Account at God's Tribunal.*

Well then, if he is so much his own Man, we may expect, that he will make his Charge good, and produce these *weighty Reasons*, and justify the Demonstrations he so frequently glories in. But so far is he from this, or making any Proof of that which he has so confidently asserted, that he doth not go about it; but contents himself, to gull the Reader with that idle Excuse, That at present he has other business: Well, however he takes care to inform us, that tho' he has now other Employment upon his hands of greater importance, yet he will find a time to call the Archbishop to account, and answer his Book, Paragraph by Paragraph; and to give us a Sample of his intended Work, he will single out his main Objection, and confute that.

Now

Now N.C. tells us, that the main Objection against *Transubstantiation* is, That 'tis contrary to Common Sense, and the Reason of Mankind; he might have added, to the Revelation of the Holy Scripture, and the Practice of the Primitive Church; for all this *His Grace* has made out, and sufficiently prov'd in that Excellent Treatise.

And first ~~the~~ *His Grace* says, the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation* is contrary to the Evidence of our Senses: " But, says " N. C. this he only says, and repeats, " but never makes the least offer to prove " it; he would have us, it seems, take " it for granted: For without this, I " believe, nay I am sure, he did not well " know how to go about to prove it. To prove what? Why, that That which I see, and feel, and smell to be Bread in the Sacrament is certainly Bread, and not Flesh, or the Body of a Man. And then he goes on: " And 'tis a thing I often admir'd, with how much Confidence this " Good Man and others, would press " this Argument (of Believing our Senses) upon us, without offering the " least Proof of it. And this seems the " more strange; because that the more " evident any thing is, as they pretend " this to be, the easier 'tis to find Mediums to prove it. But neither he, nor " all the Philosophers that ever were,

“ or are to come , shall ever be able to
 “ make one good Argument, to prove
 “ that *Transubstantiation* is contradicted
 “ by Sense. To which I shall only reply,
 That as there are some things so clear,
 that 'tis a very difficult matter to prove
 them; so there are some Objections so
 impertinent , that 'tis a very hard matter
 to answer them.

For what thinks he of Self-evident
 Principles, are they not so clear and plain,
 that they neither want, nor can have any
 Medium to prove them by? Doth not
 every one believe a *Rule is a Rule* , and
Faith is Faith, without proving it? If not,
 let him go about it; but I fear he will
 meet with the same Success his Friend
 Mr. Serjeant had. For did he never hear
 of a certain Philosopher, who when his
 Opponent denied there was any such
 thing as Motion, took no other way to
 confute him, but only Walking about?
 And truly 'tis my Opinion, that That Man
 who denys the Evidence of Sense, and
 would have it prov'd, that he sees, or feels,
 deserves only the *Argumentum Baculinum*.

But as he goes on: “ What is *Tran-*
 “ *substantiation*? Why the Change of one
 “ Substance into another. Of what sense
 “ then is Substance, the Object, that
 “ such a Change may be discover'd by it?
 “ 'Tis of no Sense sure, but of the Under-
 standing,

standing, as all the World knows. How
 “ can that then contradict sense, which
 “ is not the object of any sense; since no
 “ Faculty can be employ’d, but about its
 “ proper Object? They might as well
 “ tell us, that Colours contradict the
 “ sense of Hearing, or Sounds the sense of
 “ Seeing. Good God! what trifling is
 here? I am tired with transcribing it.

I shall not therefore enter into the detail of all his Mistakes and Misrepresentations, nor will I give him the trouble of telling me what he means by Colours contradicting the Sense of Hearing, or Sound the Sense of Seeing, for then I should never have done; but I shall only take notice of such as are material. And,

First, *Transubstantiation* is not the Change of one Substance into another, for this we allow to be possible; but ’tis such a Change, in which the Substance is altered, and yet the Accidents remain, which we hold to be altogether impossible: For where-ever the proper Accidents of any numerical Substance is, there that numerical Substance must be; Accidents are only the different Shapes and Modes of Material Beings, and have no manner of Existence distinct from the Bodies in which they inhere. The Understanding indeed can abstract the one from the
 other

other, but 'tis impossible they should have any distinct actual existence; 'tis as impossible to separate the roundness, and hardness, and blackness of one Numerical Body, and apply it to another; as that the same Body should be hard and soft, white and black, at the same time, and in the same respect.

Secondly, 'Tis evident, that Substance is the remote, tho' not the immediate Object of Sense; (*i. e.*) our *Senses* do judge of the *Substances* of things, by the perception of those proper Accidents which belong to them; and there is no other way of knowing the change of a Substance, but by the evidence of Sense, discovering the change of those *Accidents* which do belong to that Numerical Substance. And therefore our Knowledge concerning any particular Substance, must be deriv'd from the Report of the Senses: For by what Means can we tell, that this is a Book, and that a Stone, that this is a Loaf, and that a piece of Flesh, but by the Judgment of the Senses? For should any Man give me a Stone, and affirm, nay swear to me 'twas Bread; yet I should never believe him, but confide rather in the Testimony of my own Senses; because where-ever there is an Alteration of the Substance, there must needs be an Alteration of the Accidents
or

or outward Forms. A piece of Bread may be turn'd into Flesh, but then 'tis impossible it should retain the outward Form, and the same Symetry of Parts; for then it would not be Flesh, but Bread still; the change of the Substance necessarily implying the change of the Accidents also. For Extension is by the *Papists* allowed to be an Accident of the Bread; but if after the Bread is transubstantiated, all the Accidents of the Bread remain, then the Body and Blood of Christ must be extended in the Sacrament, but this the *Papists* will not allow; because they hold that the Body of Christ is present in the Sacrament, not corporally, but spiritually. But farther, 'tis evident, that there is no other way to distinguish between Flesh and Bread, but by their different Appearances to the external Sense; whereby 'tis evident, that they have a different Disposition of Parts: For if things might be substantially chang'd, and yet the same Accidents, Appearances and Objects of Sense remain; there could be no such thing as Certainty in the World, there could be no way to distinguish one thing from another; to know an Egg from an Elephant, or a Musquet-Bullet from a Pike: And if so, what would become of the main Proof of the *Christian Religion*, from *Miracles*? How could the *Apostles* be

be Witnesses of the Resurrection of our Blessed Saviour, when they knew not with what Body he rose, or whether he had any real Body or no? In short, there is nothing more big of monstrous Absurdities, than the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*; and tho' the *Papists* may endeavour to disguise it, and coin new and subtil Distinctions, with never so much Art, to keep the Learned in Play, and to impose upon the Unlearned and Ignorant; and that they may say something when press'd, tho' in truth they have nothing at all to say to the Purpose: Yet the World begins to discover the Imposture, and to be sensible of the Weakness of these frivolous Evasions, and this Doctrine will be the Mill-Stone, hung about the Neck of *Popery*, which will sink it at the last.

But says *N. C.* " Granting all you have
 " have said to be true, yet it proves no
 " more, than that ordinarily and for the
 " most part, the matter is so: But why
 " may not God notwithstanding this, do
 " otherwise upon Extraordinary Occa-
 " sions, especially in Mysteries of Faith,
 " which are not subject to the Ordinary
 " Rules of Nature? And why may not
 " we believe, that the Accidents of
 " Bread exhibit another Substance to us;
 " especially since we have the Word of
 " the Son of God for it, as well as the

" Ac-

“ Accidents of a Dove, and the Appearance of Men could represent the Holy Ghost, and the Angels to St. *John* the Baptist, and to *Lot*. *John* the Baptist saw in appearance a Dove descend, and remain upon Christ; yet he believed it was not a real Dove; because he was told by him who sent him (God) that it was the Holy Ghost, that was to descend, and remain upon him. And why may we not believe the same God, when he tells us, that that which appears to us to be Bread, is his Body, &c.

And here our Author confesses ingenuously, that we ought always to give credit to our Senses, except in such cases where God tells us, that we must not give credit to them; and so the determination of this Controversie will devolve upon this Point; Whether God has ever told us, that we must not believe our Senses; which I have good reason to deny, because I cannot be certain that any such Revelation is from God, but by the Testimony and Evidence of my Senses. Let us consider the Revelation of the Christian Religion; doth not the Proof of the Truth of this Revelation depend upon the Belief of the Resurrection of our Blessed Saviour? And this Belief depends upon the Testimony of the Apostles, and their Testimony upon the Evidence of Sense.

For

For since there is an infinitely wise and good Being, who first made, and still governs and preserves the World, he will not suffer his poor Creatures to wander in the Dark, but will give them sufficient means to come to the Knowledge of the Truth, and pursue the End of their Beings; he directs all Ranks of Creatures according to the nature of their Beings, Stones by the Laws of Motion, sensitive Beings by Instinct, rational by Reason, which depends on those Notices taken in by the Sense. So that the last Appeal both of Reason and Revelation is to Sense; we are assur'd that there is such a Book as the *Bible*, by our Senses, and 'tis by the reading or hearing of it that we come to the Knowledge of what is written in it; And therefore, if there should be any Text in Scripture which seems to contradict the plain Evidence of Sense, I should be very diligent in enquiring into the meaning of it, and wary in receiving any other Interpretation, but what is agreeable to the verdict of my Sense; For I have the same reason to believe that Interpretation to be false, which I have to believe the *Bible* I read, to be the Word of God. So that the Question is not, Whether I should
be-

believe the Holy Scripture, or no ; but when there arises a Difference about the meaning of the Holy Scripture, which Interpretation I ought to prefer, that which is agreeable to Sense and Reason, or that which is plainly contradictory to both these.

But may not God sometimes interpose and alter the usual course of Things ? May not he make Things appear otherwise than they really are ? And, is it not a sufficient Security against our being impos'd upon thereby, that God tells us this is such or such a Being ? this is *Bread*, and this *my Body* ?

But, *First*, we must be very well assur'd, that God doth tell us so, before we assent to it ; for here lies the great danger of our being impos'd upon, that we should believe that to be reveal'd to us which really is not, and mistake the meaning of those words which have a Divine Authority stamp'd upon them ; and, how can we come at the meaning of them without the Assistance of our Senses ? And if my Senses may impose upon me, 'tis impossible that I should ever know what God has reveal'd unto me.

Secondly, We may be assur'd, that God never told us any thing which contradicts the Evidence of our Senses. For God has placed our Senses in us for this
very

very End, to discover the difference of one Object from another ; the Frame and Constitution of our Nature requires it, that we should come to the knowledge of Things by the mediation of Sense ; and therefore if I may, upon any occasion, disbelieve my natural Senses speaking to me, (which is as much the Voice of God as any Revelation can be) why may I not with equal reason disbelieve those pretended Revelations which are contrary to the Evidence of my Sense ? So that 'tis impossible that any Revelation should command me to renounce my Senses, because the Truth of all Revelation must be prov'd by the Evidence of Sense, which supposes that the Evidence of Sense is always certain, and ever to be depended on. And therefore what *His Grace* says, *Volume 2. p. 67. That God can impose upon the Senses of Men, and represent things to them otherwise than they are ;* is to be understood only of God's Power ; for tho' he is able to do it, yet his Truth, and Goodness, and Justice, do restrain him from putting this Power into Act. And therefore no occasions can be so extraordinary as to oblige God to do an unjust thing, or to violate the Truth of his Word, or so far to impose upon us, as to make our Senses represent Objects different from what they truly are, which would be in effect

effect to unravel our whole Nature, and to make our Senses of no use to us.

“ But, says *N. C.* why may we not believe, that the Accidents of Bread may exhibit another Substance to us, especially since we have the Word of the Son of God for it, as well as the Accidents of a Dove and the Appearance of Men could represent the Holy Ghost, and the Angels to *St. John the Baptist*, and to *Lot* ?

And in truth, if either the Son of God had told us so, or there had been Matter of Fact, ~~and~~ this thing had actually been done, it would be to no purpose to dispute against the doing of it. But upon a little consideration it will appear, that tho’ *N. C.* according to his usual Custom, doth confidently assert both of these, yet has he no manner of Ground, or any tolerable Reason for so doing.

And therefore I shall prove,

1. That the Matter of Fact is not true, and that the Holy Ghost was not represented by the Accidents of a Dove.

2. That our Saviour Christ never told us, that the Accidents of one Substance may exhibit another Substance to us.

1. That the Matter of Fact is not true ; The Holy Ghost was never represented by the Accidents of a Dove. ’Tis true, *S. John* says, *I saw the Spirit descending*

F

from

from Heaven, like a Dove, and it abode upon him; and I knew him not. But he that sent me to baptize with water, the same said unto me, upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending, and remaining on him, the same is he that baptizeth with the Holy Ghost. *Joh. 1. 32.*

But what would N. C. infer from hence? Would he say, that this appearance of a Dove was the *Holy Ghost* cloathed with the Accidents of a Dove? He may say so indeed, but how doth he prove it? Why may not the Substance of a Dove, as well as the Accidents, be there? Why might it not be a real Dove? This was the Opinion of several of the Fathers, as *St. Austin*, *Tertullian*, as also of *Thomas Aquinas*; and they give this remarkable Reason for it; *Alioquin Spiritus Sanctus Homines falleret*; that if it was not a real Dove, the Holy Spirit would have impos'd upon the Senses of those who beheld it. It seems, they thought that it was incompatible with the Divine Attributes, to impose upon the Senses of his Creatures, tho' they receiv'd no damage thereby. Others were of Opinion, that as Fiery Tongues sat upon the Heads of the Apostles, when the Holy Spirit was infus'd into them; so this Dove, was Fire in the shape of a Dove. But whatever this Dove was, 'tis certain 'twas the visible Symbol of

of the Descent of the Holy Ghost, as the Rainbow was of the Covenant which God made with Mankind, and the Fiery Tongues which sat upon the Heads of the Apostles; and that there is not the least Shadow of a Reason to incline us to believe, that there were only the Accidents of a Dove, separated from all manner of Substance. And as little to his purpose, is the other Instance of the Appearance of Angels, under the Form of Men. That Spirits may assume a Body, is evident; but that this Bodily Shape consisted only of Accidents, lyes upon *N. C.* to prove; which he will never be able to do, nor indeed doth he make any offer at it.

2. It is as evident, that our Saviour Christ never told us, that the Accidents of one Substance, may exhibit another Substance to us; if he did, let him quote the Text.

But I suppose *N. C.* means, That tho' our Saviour Christ never said so in express Terms, yet this may reasonably be infer'd from what he says in the Holy Gospel; for when he tells us, That the Bread and Wine in the Holy Communion, was his Body and Blood; and that since 'tis evident, that the Accidents of Bread and Wine remain after the Consecration, therefore from thence it will follow, that the

Substance of Bread must be chang'd into the Substance of Christ's Body.

But this Argument is of no force. For, *First*, Tho' our Saviour Christ has told us, That the Bread in the Sacrament is his Body; yet he has not told us, that this Bread is converted into his Real Body, even the Literal Sence of the Words will not bear the Interpretation.

Secondly, We have better Evidence, That the Bread and Wine in the Sacrament is not changed into the Real Body and Blood of Christ, than that our Saviour ever said these Words; the one is evidenc'd by Three of the Senses, the other only by two. But,

Lastly, 'Tis evident, that these Words signifie no such matter, both from the Natural Signification of the Expression, and its Coherence with the Context: And because this is the last Refuge, which the *Papists* are forc'd to fly to when they have nothing else to say; I shall (in as few Words as I can) consider what our Saviour meant by these words, *This is my Body*.

In order to understand these Words, it will be necessary to consider, That the *Jews* were required to celebrate the Pass-over once a Year at *Jerusalem*, (*i. e.*) to eat a Lamb with bitter Herbs, and unleavened Bread; in Commemoration of the Deliverance of their Forefathers out of

Egypt;

Egypt : And this Lamb was called, the *Lord's Passover*, in Remembrance of that Paschal Lamb which was slain in *Egypt*, as a Sacrifice of Atonement, whereby the Lord was prevail'd with to pass over the Houses of the *Israelites*, when he slew the First-born of every House in *Egypt*. This Transaction being only the Type of Christ, who was, *the Lamb slain to take away the Sins of the World*; our Saviour took that time of the Year when the *Jews* kept the Passover, to lay down his Life, and to offer himself up for the Sins of the whole World, and instituted this Sacrament of his Body and Blood, to be kept for ever, in Remembrance of his Death and Passion.

And therefore the right understanding of the Passover, is the Key which will let us into the true meaning of this Holy Rite. For if we consider it well, it will plainly appear, that not only every Part and Circumstance of the Lord's Supper, is adjusted to the Manner of holding the Passover; but even the very Words and Phrases were the very same, the *Jews* made use of at that Holy Solemnity; and that the Words, *This is my Body*, bear a plain Relation to these in the Passover, *This is the Lord's Passover*. And therefore since these Words in the Passover signifie only, that this Lamb

F 3 which

which is slain, is for a perpetual Memorial of the Lamb slain in *Egypt*, and the Deliverance which the Children of *Israel* obtain'd by virtue of that Sacrifice: So these Words in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, *This is my Body*, only denote to us, that this Bread represents my Body, which is to be offer'd up for you upon the Cross. And this Interpretation receives great Strength from hence, because this Form of Speech became very customary amongst the *Jews*, so that there was nothing more usual than for them to say, this is such a thing, when they design'd to intimate, that this signify'd or represented that very thing; I might give you many instances, but one shall serve instead of all, *Gen. 41. 26. Joseph* expounding *Pharaoh's* Dream to him, says, *The seven good Kine are seven Tears, and the seven good Ears of Corn are seven Years.* And (as *His Grace* tells us) it was not only so amongst the *Jews*, but it is common in all Languages to give the Name of the Thing signified to the Sign. As the Delivery of a Deed or Writing under Hand and Seal is call'd a Conveyance, or making over of such an Estate; and it is really so, not the Delivery of meer Wax and Parchment, but the Conveyance of a real Estate, as truly and real-

ly to all effects and purposes of Law, as if the very material Houses and Lands themselves could be, and were actually delivered into our Hands. And that this is the true meaning of the Words, will be evident from what immediately follows them, That he calls it *his Body broken*, and *his Blood shed*, even before his Passion; and after the Consecration, he calls it *the Fruit of the Vine* still. And that the *Apostles* understood it in a Figurative Sense, is evident, because they were not startled at this Expression, as they would certainly have been, if they had thought the meaning of it was, that they must eat his very Flesh, and drink his Blood. And afterwards, when the *Jews* mistook him, and took his Words in a literal sense, he tells them, That *the words which he spake unto them, were Spirit and Life*, i. e. ought to be taken in a Spiritual and Figurative Sense. This is only a taste of what is and might be said on this Subject; but I shall look back and consider how *N. C.* represents it, and what Colours he puts upon it.

And, *First*, *N. C.* tells us, That these Words must be taken in such a literal Sense, as denotes the change of the Substance of the Bread into the Substance of Christ's Body. He argues from Christ's Promise, *John 6. 51. I am the living Bread*

which came down from Heaven ; if any Man eat of this Bread, he shall live for ever : And the Bread that I will give is my Flesh, which I will give for the Life of the World.

To which I answer, That these Words are plainly spoke of the Doctrine of our Saviour Christ, which St. John compares with the Law of Moses, and alludes plainly to the *Manna* which Moses gave to the Children of *Israel* in the Wilderness, which those who eat of dy'd ; but our Saviour gives his Followers such Food, ~~and~~ will keep them alive for ever. The Children of *Israel* were fed with temporal Promises, the Disciples of our Saviour with the hopes and assurance of a blessed Eternity ; and therefore in the 47th Verse he says, *He that believeth in me hath everlasting Life*, whereby he explains what he means by *eating his Flesh*, i. e. believing his Doctrine, and hereby being made Partaker of his Death and Passion.

Secondly, He quotes 1 Cor. 10. 16. *The Cup of Blessing which we bless, is it not the Communion of the Blood of Christ ? The Bread which we break, is it not the Communion of the Body of Christ ?* Now says he, to communicate or partake of the Body and Blood of Christ, is certainly to eat and drink of his Body and Blood.

But

But 'tis evident, that by Communicating of the Body and Blood of Christ, nothing else is meant, but being made Partakers of the real Benefits of his Death and Passion, as by *Baptism* Christians are said to be made Partakers of the Holy Ghost, *Heb.* 6. 4. because presently afterward he several times calls it *Bread*, *v.* 17. *for we being many, are one Bread and one Body; for we are Partakers of that one Bread.* And therefore N. C. might, if he pleas'd, as well argue from hence, That all Christians are substantially changed, first into Bread, and then into the natural Body of Christ, by their participation of the Sacrament, because they are said thereby *to be one Bread and one Body.*

Thirdly, N. C. quotes *1 Cor.* 11. 27, 28, 29. *Wherefore whosoever shall eat this Bread or drink this Cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord. But let a Man examine himself, and so let him eat of that Bread and drink of that Cup; for he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh Damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's Body.* 'Certainly, says he, *Dam-*
'*nation* is too great a Punishment for the
'violation of the Types and Representa-
'tions only of Christ's Body; therefore
'the Bread and the Cup are the true and
'real Body and Blood of Christ.

But

But this Objection is of no force, because *St. Paul* tells us plainly, That 'tis Bread that is eaten, and the Cup or Wine that is drank; and whosoever eats and drinks these unworthily (as the *Corinthians* did) is guilty of the Body and Blood of Christ, *i. e.* by prophaning this Holy Ordinance, *they crucifie Christ afresh, and put him to an open shame*; and therefore he is accounted in the sight of God, as truly guilty of the Death of Christ, as if with his Hands he had nail'd him to the Cross, because he obstinately and wilfully continues in those Sins which were the occasions of his Death and Passion. And now I think it will appear very evident from these Hints I have given, That *Transubstantion* has no Foundation in the Holy Scripture, and in truth this is so evident, that many of their most learned Writers are forc'd to confess it. And if so, then the People are not so grossly abus'd as *N. C.* wou'd have us believe, when they are told how monstrously absurd this Doctrine is; and that 'tis as evident, that *Transubstantiation* is contrary to the common sense of Mankind, as that twice two make four. Such Doctrine certainly better becomes the Pulpit than that Credulity the *Papists* preach up, whereby the People are led blindfold by an implicit Faith, into the belief of Nonsense and Contradiction; and are not only

ly rook'd of their Money, but perswaded out of their Senses. For, as *his Grace* tells us, Credulity is certainly a Fault as well as Infidelity; and he who said, *Blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed*, hath no where said, *Blessed are they that have seen, and yet have not believed*; much less, *Blessed are they that believe directly contrary to their Senses*.

I had like to have forgot the Challenge which this Champion of the *Roman Cause* makes to all his Adversaries; *That if any one will bring but one single Argument in Mood and Figure, to prove that Transubstantiation doth either contradict Sense or Reason, he doth sincerely promise, he will be of his Opinion the very next moment*. This is so Light and Boyish, that I shall only make this Reply to it; That when he has return'd a serious and solid Answer to any one *Paragraph* in the Archbishop's Treatise, or made good one Leaf he has written, his Challenge shall be accepted. And for his *sincere Promises of Conversion*, I shall pray to God that by the assistance of his Grace, he may be *in this* as good as his word.

As to the Quotation he brings from the *Socinian*, I have already prov'd that the *Socinian* is mistaken, and that his Lordship is certainly in the right in affirming, That *Transubstantiation* may be disprov'd by the Senses of Mankind, and that for this plain Reason,

Reason, because there can be no change in the Substance which doth not affect the Accidents ; but his Lordship has explain'd this Matter so well himself, that I shall have no need to take up the Cudgels, and and therefore I shall only remark, that it is at the Forge of these *Philistines*, that the *Papists* sharpen their Weapons, who are for sailing with every Wind which flatters them with the least hopes of Advantage.

I should now take my leave of this Subject, but that I find he has reserv'd his most doughty Objection for a parting Blow, and tells us that the Archbishop says ; That *Transubstantiation* was first introduc'd into the Catholick Religion, about the latter end of the Eighth Century in the second Council of *Nice*, and that it was almost 300 Years before this mis-shapen Monster was lick'd into that Form in which it is now settled and establish'd in the Church of *Rome*. But that he is mistaken near 200 Years ; well then, he grants that it was not introduc'd till the latter end of the sixth Century. But, how doth he prove that the Archbishop was mistaken ? Why, Dr. *Humphry* says, that St. *Austin* brought this Doctrine into *England* ; I have not the Book by me, and therefore cannot contradict him ; but however, from those Words he
has

has quoted, no such Inference can be made, because the first Notion of *Transubstantiation* was far different from that which obtained in After-times, this mis-shapen Monster growing still more deform'd, till it obtain'd that frightful Aspect we now find it in; of which the Popish Doctors are so sensible, that they are continually employ'd in taking off the Excesses, paring the Claws, licking it into Shape, and yet they do but render it more ugly by that awkward Resemblance it bears to a Rational Form.

And now, I hope, it will easily be determin'd, whether *His Grace* or *N. C.* has the most right to those *hard words* (as he calls them) with which *N. C.* concludes this Chapter.

Of Communion in one kind.

IN stating the Subject of Dispute on this Head, our *Author* tells us, that the main Stress lies here :

Whether or no it be in the Power of the Church, to alter her Discipline, in a Matter of this Importance; so as to restrain the Faithful, to the Receiving the Sacrament in one kind only.

But this is a false Representation. For *First*, This is no Matter of Discipline, but of Right, and Positive Institution. *2dly*. 'Tis essential to the Nature of this Sacrament, that it should be administred in both kinds; and therefore 'tis not in the Power of the Church to alter it. Nor *3dly*. Is there any Reasonable Cause, so to do.

First, Our Saviour instituted this Sacrament in both kinds. *Matth. 26. 26.* *And as they were eating, Jesus took bread, and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to the disciples, and said, take, eat; this is my body. And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, drink ye all of this; for this is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many, for the remission of sins. But I say unto you, I*
will

will not henceforth drink of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom. In which Institution 'tis very remarkable, that our Saviour lays a particular Stress upon the Administration of the Cup; foreseeing that there would arise a Set of Men, who would sacrilegiously deprive the People of it. And therefore whereas he says only of the Bread, *take, eat*; he says of the Cup, *drink ye all of this*; and gives the Reason why they should *all* drink of it; because this denoted to them his Blood which was shed for the Remission of their Sins: And therefore as many as expected Remission of Sins by the *shedding of his Blood*, ought to partake of this Fœderal Rite, and be frequently put in mind of his Death and Passion: And agreeably hereunto, in 1 Cor. 11. 23, 24, &c. the Apostle St. Paul writing to the Corinthians, tells them: *For I have received of the Lord, that which also I delivered unto you; that the Lord Jesus, the same night in which he was betray'd, took bread; and when he had given thanks he brake it, and said, take eat, this is my body which is broken for you; this do in remembrance of me. After the same manner also he took the cup, when he had supped, saying, This cup is the New Testament in my blood, this do, as oft as you drink it in remembrance of me: For as often*

as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death till he come. Wherefore, whosoever shall eat this bread, and drink this cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord. But let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup : For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's body. Which evidently demonstrates to us, that not only the *Apostles*, but also the whole Congregation, did receive the *Cup* as well as the *Bread*. And as 'tis evident that our Saviour thus instituted the Sacrament in both kinds, and that it was thus administered in the times of the *Apostles*; so it will plainly appear, both from Reason and the Practice of the Primitive Church, that thus it ought still to be administered; and that the receiving the *Cup* as well as the *Bread*, is absolutely necessary to a due Participation of this Sacrament. For since all Sacraments receive their Efficacy not from any inherent Virtue of the Outward Signs to produce such Effects, but from God's Institution of them to such Blessed Ends and Purposes; therefore it follows, that we ought to keep up, as near as possibly we can, to our Saviour's Institution, and follow his Example. Now one chief End of celebrating this Sacrament, is

to put us in mind of the Death of Christ, the breaking of his Body, and pouring out of his Blood; but this cannot be fully represented to us, but by the pouring out of the Wine, as well as the breaking of the Bread.

And that this was thus perform'd in the Primitive Times, is evident; the *Papists* not being able to give us any one Instance of any Publick Celebration of this Sacrament, where 'twas administred in one kind only. And to do them justice, they do confess this, and yet directly contrary to the plain Command and Institution of our Blessed Saviour, they enjoin the People, on Pain of Eternal Damnation, to receive this Sacrament in one kind only; and the Council of *Constance* decrees, that tho' our Saviour instituted the Sacrament thus, and tho' it was administred thus in the Primitive Times; yet since such a Custom of receiving it in one kind only, had crept into the Church, they think fit it should be continu'd, and that the Bread only should be given to the People. This is the substance of what *His Grace* has said in several of his Sermons.

To this *N.G.* replies, 'That tho' our Saviour did institute the Sacrament in both kinds, yet in several places of the *Scripture* he mentions but one; and quotes three Places in the sixth Chapter of *St. John's Gospel*,

Gospel, where he speaks of the Bread only; as *vers. 50. This is the bread which cometh down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof, and not dye: vers. 51. I am the living bread, which came down from heaven; if any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever: and the bread that I will give, is my flesh. And vers. 58. This is that bread which came down from heaven, he that eateth of this bread shall live for ever.* He also tells us, that there are three other Passages in the same Chapter, which speak of giving the Cup as well as the Bread: As *vers. 53 Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you: vers. 54. Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life: vers. 56. He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him.* Now says N. C. “ If it be true, that the Man who
 “ eateth of this bread, shall live for ever;
 “ How can it be at the same time true,
 “ that he cannot live, except he eat the
 “ Bread, and drink the Cup? Must we
 “ then hold these three Passages, and
 “ reject the rest? As to the Protestants, I
 “ do not see how it can stand with their
 “ Principles to do otherwise.

To which I answer: *First*, That it doth not appear that this Chapter doth relate to the *Lord's Supper*; but that the Bread he speaks of, is the Doctrine of the
 Holy

Holy Gospel, and that we eat it by Faith : And therefore he says, *vers. 47. Verily, verily I say unto you, that he that believeth on me hath everlasting life :* And this is the Opinion of some Learned Men amongst the *Papists*, and particularly of Cardinal *Cajetan*. But taking it for granted, that these Words do relate to the *Lord's Supper*, yet 'tis evident that the Words are not to be taken literally, but in a spiritual Sense : This *N. C.* is forc'd to confess, and says, " That they cannot " be understood in the proper and strict " Meaning of the Words ; but that Eating and Drinking, do denote only the " Partaking of the Body and Blood of the " Lord : But certainly they do denote the different manner of receiving the Parts of this Holy Sacrament, Eating and Drinking being two distinct Acts. And since our Saviour says so often in the same *Chapter*, that, *unless we eat and drink his Body and Blood, we cannot have Everlasting Life :* Therefore where Eating only is mention'd, Drinking must be included in it ; and that it is so, the Practice of the *Apostles*, and the *Primitive Church* for a Thousand Years, is an undeniable Proof.

The next Text which *N. C.* quotes, is taken from the 24th of *St. Luke* ; where the Evangelist tell us, that Christ, after his

Resurrection, appear'd to two of his Disciples, as they went to *Emmaus*, who constrained him to abide with them; and when he sat at Meat, *He took Bread, and blessed it, and brake, and gave it to them; and their eyes were opened, and they knew him, and he vanished out of their sight.* ' Now ' says N.C. 'tis certain, that if this Bread, ' which Christ bless'd and brake, was the ' *Eucharist*, we have at least one Instance, ' in which Christ himself gave the Communion in onekind. To which I might return; That if the *Papists* have no other Instance but this, and this Bread was not the *Eucharist*, then they have no Instance that our Saviour gave the Communion in one kind; and that this Bread was not the *Eucharist*, is more than probable, because our Saviour did not discover himself to them till after they had broke Bread; and it is not probable, that they would receive the Sacrament from one they did not know. *Breaking of Bread* was usual at their ordinary Meals, and is frequently spoke of in the Holy Scripture, when there was no Sacrament. And there is a good Reason why our Saviour should *Bless*, and *Break Bread* at *Emmaus*, that thereby he might convince his *Disciples* of the truth of his Resurrection; and that by conversing thus familiarly with them, they might be assur'd that he was that *Jesus* who

who was crucify'd. And yet granting that this was the Sacrament, yet since there is no other Account given of the Manner of its Celebration, nor any other Circumstance mention'd, but only the *Breaking of Bread*; it cannot from hence be infer'd, that our Saviour did not consecrate the Wine as well as the Bread, or that the Communion was given *in one Kind only*. But so ready are the *Papists* to snatch at the Shadow of an Argument that they will let nothing pass, which they think they can wind and turn to their purpose, tho' they lose the Substance thereby.

But N. C. confidently affirms, that by *breaking Bread* in the *Acts of the Apostles*, is always meant the *Communion*; and therefore I desire him to consult *Acts* 27. 35. where *St. Paul* took Bread, and gave Thanks to God in presence of them all; and when he had broken it, he began to eat. Which I believe N. C. himself will not say, was meant of the Sacrament; and because he adds, that four Great Men were of Opinion, that the *breaking of Bread* at *Emmaus* was the Celebration of the Sacrament, I shall only oppose the Authority of one, no very great Man, against them all, (*i. e.* himself) who confesses, that this is not so interpreted by the universal consent of the Church.

And now having examin'd these Texts of Scripture which N. C. has brought, to prove his *Half Communion*; I cannot imagine what reason he has to break out into the following Remonstrance, with such foul Language, and so many indecencies of Expression.

“ And now, who would believe, says
 “ he, that the *Roman Catholicks* had such
 “ grounds in Scripture for the *Communion*
 “ *in one Kind*, considering the loud and
 “ clamorous Accusations, yea, and the
 “ horrible Sacrileges they are charg'd
 “ with upon this Subject? Well, and
 “ who are these who charge us? Why,
 “ they are great and eminent Men; great
 “ indeed, not only for the Rank and Sta-
 “ tion wherein *the Powers of this World*
 “ have plac'd them, but also great for their
 “ Learning, and other excellent Endow-
 “ ments. But then, 'tis that they must
 “ so do; the *Protestant Religion*, as all
 “ the World knows, was planted in these
 “ Kingdoms by open Force and Violence.
 “ These Gentlemens Predecessors pos-
 “ sess'd themselves of the rich Benefices of
 “ the Church; and when Mens Interest
 “ and Honour are once engag'd, 'tis hard
 “ if they do not stand by them. Now
 “ there is no way left to justifie these Pro-
 “ ceedings, but by railing at the Church
 “ of *Rome*, &c. In which few Lines, there

is so much Scandal cram'd in, and pack'd so close together, that it would require more Time and Paper than I have here to take it off, and retort it ; nor indeed do I care to foul my Fingers with that Filth, which without Sense or Reason, he so liberally casts about him.

“ But, says N. C. supposing that our
 “ Saviour did institute the Sacrament *in*
 “ *in both Kinds*, yet to Administer the Sa-
 “ crament *in one Kind only*, is not contra-
 “ ry to our Saviour's Institution, because
 “ the Administration of the Communion,
 “ whether in one or both Kinds, is quite
 “ another thing from the Institution of
 “ it.

To which I answer, That our Saviour did both institute and administer the Sacrament at the same time ; but with respect to us, the Administration and the Institution of the Sacrament is quite different ; and therefore *His Grace* argues thus ; Christ instituted the Sacrament in both Kinds, and therefore thus it ought to be administred, because every Administration ought to come as near as possibly it can to the first Institution ; and tho' some Circumstances may be alter'd, yet no essential Part ought to be omitted, especially when our Saviour has made his Institution the Copy by which we ought to act, and commanded us to do the same

that he did. And that the giving the Cup is not a Circumstance, but an essential part of this Sacrament, is plain; by considering the End for which this Sacrament was instituted, which was to represent to us the Death and Sufferings of our Blessed Saviour, to seal to us the Pardon of our Sins, and to convey down to us those Benefits which he has purchas'd for us by his Death and Passion. Now this cannot be so effectually and significantly perform'd by receiving the Bread only, which represents to us only the Body of Christ, as by the receiving the Cup, whereby the pouring out of his Blood and his Death upon the Cross is signified to us. This N. C. confesses; " But, says he, the
 " Question is not, Whether Christ gave
 " it in both Kinds, but whether we ought
 " necessarily to give it in both Kinds, be-
 " cause he did so? This the Doctor af-
 " firms, and we deny. But is it not plain,
 that Christ commanded his Disciples to
 do what he did? And if so, then if our
 Saviour Christ gave the Sacrament *in both*
Kinds, we ought so to do. " But, says
 " N. C. the giving it in *one Kind*, or
 " *both*, is only a Circumstance, and not
 " essential to the Sacrament: But, why
 should not the giving the Bread be a Cir-
 cumstance as well as giving the Cup? and
 then

then both may be omitted; and if so, what will become of the Sacrament?

“ But, says N. C. we are not oblig’d
 “ to do every thing that Christ did, nor
 “ imitate what he did both before and af-
 “ ter the Sacrament, and therefore we are
 “ not oblig’d to give the Cup in the Sa-
 “ crament. But this doth in no wise fol-
 low; because we are strictly charg’d to ob-
 serve all the Essential Parts of this Ordi-
 nance; nor can any Power upon Earth
 dispense with our non-observance of them.
 And therefore we may justly wonder at
 the Council of *Constance*, which decreed
 the giving the Sacrament *in one Kind* on-
 ly, with a *non obstante* to the Institution of
 Christ, and the Practice of Christians in
 the first Ages of the Church.

But that the Council of *Constance* did
 thus decree it, N. C. roundly denies, and
 delivers himself after this following man-
 ner: “ Good God! What may not Men
 “ undertake, who have the confidence to
 “ give out such Calumnies for Truth?
 “ ’Tis a vulgar Observation, but a true
 “ one, that when Mountebanks pretend
 “ most to infallible Cures, they are then
 “ farthest from them; just so ’tis with
 “ those Gentlemen, when they pretend
 “ most to Evidence and Demonstration
 “ in Matters of Religion, then they have
 “ the least colour, or reasonable pretence
 “ to

“ to it. But the best way to refute this
 “ Calumny, is to cite the very words of
 “ the Council, and then let the Reader
 “ judge what Faith is to be given to Men
 “ who ~~vent~~ such Impostures for Truth.

Well, since he has appeal'd to the Council, To the Council we will go. And the Words of the Council are these ; “ In the
 “ Name of the Holy and undivided Trinity, the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.
 “ *Amen.* Since there are certain Persons
 “ in divers Parts of the World who presume to assert, That all Christian People ought to receive the Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist in both Kinds, under the Species of Bread and Wine.
 “ And that the Laity communicated not only under the Species of Bread, but also under the Species of Wine, even after Supper, and when they are not fasting ; and that they obstinately maintain, that they ought thus to receive it, contrary to the laudable custom of the Church, grounded upon Reason, which they endeavour to condemn as Sacrilegious. For this reason, this present holy and general Council held at *Constance*, assisted by the holy holy Spirit of God, and being met in order to provide for the Safety of the Faithful against this Error, after a long consultation of many Doctors, both of
 “ Divinity

“ Divinity and Law, doth declare, de-
 “ cree, and define, That tho’ Christ af-
 “ ter Supper, did institute and administer
 “ to his Disciples in both Kinds, both of
 “ the Bread and Wine, this venerable Sa-
 “ crament, yet this, notwithstanding the
 “ laudable Authority of the holy Canons
 “ and the approved Custom of the Church,
 “ hath, and doth oblige us to hold, that
 “ this Sacrament ought not to be celebra-
 “ ted after Supper, nor at such times
 “ when the Faithful are not Fasting, un-
 “ less in case of Sickneſs, or of absolute
 “ Neceſſity, allow’d by the Law or the
 “ Church. And ſince this Cuſtom is
 “ reaſonably introduc’d, to avoid ſome
 “ Inconveniencies and Dangers, that tho’
 “ in the Primitive Church the Faithful
 “ did receive the Sacrament in both
 “ Kinds, and afterwards the Prieſt that
 “ Adminiſtered in both Kinds, and the
 “ Laity under the Species of Bread, yet
 “ it is moſt firmly to be believed, and in
 “ no wiſe to be doubted of, that the
 “ whole Body and Blood of Chriſt is tru-
 “ ly contain’d under the Species either of
 “ Bread or Wine; a cuſtom of recei-
 “ ving it only in one Kind only, has
 “ been introduc’d, and long obſerv’d,
 “ the ſame is to be held as a Law, that
 “ may neither be rejected nor chang’d,
 “ otherwiſe than by the Church’s Autho-
 “ rity.

And

And presently afterwards; “ And this
 “ holy Synod doth decree, — That those
 “ who Administer the Sacrament to the
 “ People under both Kinds, and teach,
 “ that it ought so to be administred, shall
 “ be effectually punished.

In Nomine Sanctæ & Individuæ Trinitatis, Patris, & Filii, & Spiritus Sancti, Amen. Cum in nonnullis mundi partibus quidam temerariè asserere præsumant, Populum Christianum debere Sacrum Eucharistiæ Sacramentum sub utraque Panis & Vini specie suscipere, & non solum specie Panis, sed etiam sub specie Vini Populum Laicum passim etiam post cœnam, vel aliàs non jejunum, & communicandum esse pertinaciter asserant; contra laudabilem Ecclesiæ consuetudinem rationabiliter approbatam, quam tanquam sacrilegam damnabiliter reprobare conantur: Hinc est, quòd hoc præsens Concilium sacrum generale Constantiense, in Spiritu Sancto legitime congregatum, adversus hunc errorem saluti fidelium providere satagens, matura plurium Doctorum, tam divini quam humani juris, deliberatione præhabita; declarat, decernit, & deffinit; quòd licet Christus post cœnam instituerit, & suis Discipulis administraverit sub utraque specie Panis & Vini hoc venerabile Sacramentum; tamen hoc non obstante, sacrorum Canonum Autoritas laudabilis, & approbata Consuetudo Ecclesiæ servavit, & servat; quòd hujusmodi Sacramentum

mentum non debet confici post cœnam, neque à fidelibus recipi non jejunis; nisi in casu infirmitatis, aut alterius necessitatis, à Jure vel Ecclesia concessio, vel admissio. Et sicut Consuetudo hæc ad evitandum aliqua pericula & scandala, est rationabiliter introducta; quòd licet in Primitiva Ecclesia hujusmodi Sacramentum reciperetur à fidelibus sub utraque specie; postea à conficientibus sub utraque, & à Laicis tantummodo sub specie Panis suscipiatur; cum certissime credendum sit, & nullatenus dubitandum, integram Christi Corpus & Sanguinem, tam sub specie Panis, quam sub specie Vini, veraciter contineri.

Item ipsa Sancta Synoda decernit & declarat super ista materia, Reverendissimis in Christo Patribus & Dominis, Patriarchis, &c. ut effectualiter puniant eos contra hoc Decretum excedentes; qui communicando Populi sub utraque specie Panis & Vini exhortati fuerint, & sic faciendum esse docuerint, &c.

And now, let any one who reads this judge to whom Credit is to be given, and whether N. C. or *His Grace*, is most likely to vend *Impostures for Truth*. For, doth not the Council say, That our Saviour instituted the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper in both Kinds? Doth it not confess, That thus it was received by the Faithful in the Primitive Times of the Church? And yet notwithstanding all this,

this, doth it not decree, That those Priests shall be punish'd that Administer to the ~~to~~ the People in both Kinds, or teach that thus it ought to be Administred? What shall we say to those Men who know these things, and yet have the Forehead to deny them? But this is very agreeable to that Rule which N. C. lays down in the foregoing Chapter; "That in this sort
 " of Writing, *i. e.* in disputing with He-
 " reticks, 'tis natural for any Man to take
 " all kind of just Advantage of his Ad-
 " versary in order to confute him, even
 " to the silencing of some part of the
 " Truth, when it is not to his purpose.

And now tho' it seems sufficiently evident, even by their own confession, that this Practice of giving the Sacrament was but of late date, and a novel Invention; and introduc'd into the Church without any good Reason: Yet I shall consider what N. C. has farther to say for himself. Now amongst those other Shifts and Evasions *Papists* have invented, the chief is the Doctrine of *Concomitancy*; the meaning of which is this; They say there is no need of receiving the Cup, because the Body of Christ doth contain the Blood; so that whosoever receives the Body of Christ, receives the Blood also. And indeed this seems to be the natural Consequence of that absurd Doctrine of *Transubstantia-*
tion;

tion: For when they once came to be so hardy as to believe, that the whole Body and Blood of Christ is in the Sacrament, and that in every crumb of the Bread, there is a whole Christ; Body, Soul, and Divinity; and that our Saviour took himself in his own Hand, and gave himself to his Disciples, and put himself into his own Mouth: Then from these notorious Absurdities, 'twas natural to infer many more. To conclude; That the Receiving a whole Christ ought to be but one entire Act, and that after they had received a whole Christ in the Wafer, it would constitute a new Sacrament, to receive him over again in the Cup; and therefore they brought in the Custom of Receiving is *one kind only*. Thus fruitful of Absurdities in Error.

Against this Doctrine of *Concomitancy* *His Grace* argues, That in the Sacrament the Bread represents Christ's Body without the Blood, the Cup his Blood poured out; and both together, the Death and Crucifixion of our Blessed Saviour: But *His Grace* doth not say, (as *N. C.* would have him,) That the Body of our Saviour Christ was drain'd of every drop of Blood; but that the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper being a Representation of the Death and Passion of our Blessed Saviour: His Body is represented by the Bread, and his
Blood

Blood is represented as poured out, by the Wine; and that both these make up the Type or Representation of his Passion; and that therefore both these are essential to the due Administration of this Sacrament.

N.C. acknowledges, That the Primitive Christians did receive it thus, and agrees with *His Grace*, in giving the very same Reason for it: *Because the Representation of the Death of our Lord is more fully express'd in both kinds, than in one.* But then he tells us, that he must consider, “ That this Representation is not of that
 “ Importance, as to balance all the
 “ weighty Considerations, that mov'd
 “ the Church to command the use only
 “ of one kind; or to make amends for
 “ the horrid Prophanation and Abuses,
 “ which must inevitably attend the Com-
 “ munion in both kinds, in a degenerate
 “ Age, in which all Piety and Goodness
 “ are almost extinguish'd.

But what weighty Considerations, and what scandalous Abuses he means, I do not know; for most of those he instances in, are not so. *Bellarmino* indeed tells us, That the Cup is taken away, because one Priest could not administer to a great Number of Communicants; that in some Places they have no Wine, and some Persons have a natural aversness for it: But cer-

certainly these could not be the *weighty* Reasons: For he must needs be sensible, that none of these could be a Reason ~~of~~ denying the Cup to the People, but in some extraordinary Cases, which ought not to be a Rule for the constant Administration of it. Nor can I imagine what Abuses the Cup is more liable to than the Bread; unless that in some Countries it should hang upon the prophane Whiskers of the Laity; and then in such a Case, most People would judge it more expedient, that those Persons should be anathematized, who would not cut off their Whiskers, rather than that the good People should be defrauded of one half of the Sacrament, and be deprived of the precious Blood of their Blessed Saviour.

I have never heard of any other Abuses objected against those who receive this Sacrament in both kinds; only N. C. (whose Talent lyes peculiarly in Scandal) tells us of some "*Libertine Protestants*,
 " who being drunk over night, come in
 " the Morning to receive the Sacrament,
 " and drink up whole Communion-Cups
 " of Consecrated Wine. But such Scandalous Reports as these are so commonly forg'd amongst the *Papists*, that no Reader who has but the least Taste of their Writings, can be shock'd at them;

H

and

and therefore I shall esteem this silly Story of equal Authority with the *Nags-head* Fable. And truly I am so much his Friend, that I cannot forbear giving him a little Advice : That he would either give over his Endeavours to Impose upon the World by such idle Reports; or quit the Title to, *The Author of the True and Modest Account.*

For let me (who know this Matter better than he can do,) assure him, that this Sacrament is Administred in all our Churches, with the greatest Decency and Solemnity imaginable; and that we are as free from all these Prophanations and Abuses, as the Church of *Rome* can be.

But suppose a drop or two of the Wine should chance to be spilt, this is no greater Prophanation of the Sacrament, than the dropping some crumbs of the Bread; which in the Primitive Church must frequently happen, when they sent some portions of the Consecrated Bread to their absent Friends; and sometimes sent the Holy Sacrament by Boys to the Sick, and gave the Wine to Sucking-Children: And if this is a sufficient Cause of depriving the People of the Cup, for the same Reason they might take away the Bread also.

N.C.'s

N. C.'s last Excuse (to take off the Guilt of Sacrilege from his Church) is, That the *Papists* may as well vary from Christ's Institution in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, as we *Protestants* do in the Sacrament of Baptism, by substituting Sprinkling, instead of Dipping: But 'tis evident that there is an absolute Necessity for this in cold Countries: And we may be assur'd, both from the Holy Scripture, and the Contemplation of the Divine Attributes; that God is better pleas'd with an Act of *Mercy*, than *Sacrifice*.

Of Prayers in an unknown Tongue.

IN the beginning of this Chapter, our Author endeavours to impose upon the ignorant and unwary Reader, by denying the Matter of Fact, and affirming, that the *Papists* do not pray in an *unknown Tongue*, but in the *Latin Tongue*, which is the most *known Tongue* in the World; taking it for granted, That the Publick Prayers of the Church ought to be offer'd up in the same Tongue all the World over.

By saying that they pray in the most *known Tongue*, *N. C.* seems to grant, that 'tis most suitable to the nature of Prayer to be offer'd up in that *Tongue*, which is best understood by the People. But then the Question will be,

Whether the daily Offices of the Church ought to be offer'd up in all Countries and Places in one Language, or else in every Country in that Language, which is best understood by those Persons who are requir'd to join in these Publick Offices of Religion? And methinks there should not be much contention about this matter, when the Dispute may be so easily decided, by the common Sense of Man-

Mankind, and the exprefs Words of the Holy Scripture. But let us hear what the Archbishop says on this Subject ;

And, *First*, *His Grace* says, That the celebrating the Divine Service in an *unknown Tongue*, is contrary to the Practice of the Primitive Church. And for the Proof of this he quotes *Origen* : And *Belarmin* himself confesses, that the *Armenians*, *Egyptians*, *Ethiopians*, *Russians*, and others did, and do still use their own Language in their *Liturgies* even at this Day.

To which *N. C.* answers, ‘ That by an ‘ *unknown Tongue* is meant, either such a ‘ *Tongue* as no body understands, or else ‘ such a *Tongue* as is *unknown* to most of the ‘ common People. But this is the most senseless Distinction that can be imagined ; for, how can there be such a *Tongue* which no body understands ? Or, in other words, such a *Tongue* which no body in the World can speak ; for no body can speak a *Tongue* which he doth not understand Well, but *N. C.* tells us, ‘ The Primitive Church, ‘ and all succeeding Generations, (he ‘ means the *Latin Church*) did celebrate ‘ Divine Service in the *Latin Tongue* ; and then he tells us, ‘ That the common People (except the *Italians*) were always ‘ ignorant of the *Latin Tongue*. What, in the *Latin Church*, and in the *Primitive Times* ? And if so, how came Divine Ser-

vice to be said at first in the *Latin Tongue*? Was it for this Reason, because the common People did not understand it? or, because this was the Language which was most universally understood in the *Roman Empire*? And if so, then what *His Grace* affirms is evidently true, That the celebrating the Divine Service in an *unknown Tongue*, is contrary to the Practice of the Primitive Church.

'Tis true, that in After-times, by the inundation of the barbarous Nations upon the *Roman Empire*, the *Romans* lost their Language by degrees, and yet the Governours of the Church still kept up Divine Service in the *Latin Tongue*; which at last was wholly *unknown* to the common People. And that about the ninth and tenth Centuries, when a gross Ignorance cover'd this part of the World, the *Pope* and the *Priests* took away the Key of Knowledge, and put it under the Door for several Ages, till the Reformation fetch'd it out again, and rub'd off the rust of it.

Secondly, *His Grace* argues from the Nature and End of Religious Worship which ought to be a *reasonable Service* and this it cannot be, if it be not directed by our Understandings, and accompanied with our Hearts and Affections. But if 'tis perform'd in an *unknown Tongue*, our Understanding can have no part in it; and

and if we do not understand it, it cannot move our Affections.

N. C. replies, 'That all this he readily grants, and that he hopes they are as careful in the *Romish Church* to teach the common People their Prayers in their own *Tongue*, and to exhort them to say them in the same *Tongue* as their Neighbours. But the direct contrary is too evident; and (tho' in this particular too, he thinks it convenient to *silence some part of the Truth*, because it is not to his purpose to have it discovered) yet it is notorious, that even the common People are taught to say their Prayers in *Latin*, a Language which they do not understand. But supposing they do teach, or at least allow the common Peoples saying their Prayers in a Language they do understand; yet what is this to the *Publick Prayers* of the *Church*, of which we are now discoursing? Certainly, if our *Private Prayers* ought to be offer'd up with Understanding, our *Publick Prayers* ought to be much more so; for, how can they be said to be *Publick Prayers* when the People do not join in them? And, how can they join in that they do not understand? And, what reason can be given why the People should not understand their *Publick* as well as their *Private Prayers*? Is God less honour'd by them? or, are we

not as capable of being edified, and of having our Hearts and Affections mov'd and excited by them? Where lies the difference?

N.C. confesses all this; but comes in with a *notwithstanding*, *the Church doth not think fit to alter it*. But what Church doth not think fit? Why the *Romish Church*: And therefore I think it a very good Reason why that Church should receive considerable Alterations, and a thorough Reformation: Because 'tis plain, that it is so much corrupted; that it cannot be prevail'd on to reform the most notorious and scandalous Abuses: Nay, that it is so far from reforming them, that it endeavours to keep People in Ignorance of the most necessary part of their Duty, and has double-lock'd the Door of Knowledge: For as if their saying their Prayers in an *unknown tongue* was not sufficient, and lest there should be some of the Congregation who should understand the *Latin Tongue*, and by consequence join in their Publick Worship, N.C. tells us, *That the greatest part of the Mass is pronounc'd so low, that scarce any who is present hears what is said*. So that if there is any such thing in the World, as a *Tongue which no Man can understand*, it is that Tongue in which they celebrate the Publick Prayers of their Church; which
com-

common Reason tells us, ought to be the Tongue which is best understood.

3. But if the *Papists* will not be persuaded to follow the Primitive Practice of the Church, (to which they pretend to pay great Deference) nor receive any conviction from the Reason of the thing, or the End of Divine Worship; yet methinks they should hearken to the Voice of God, in the Revelation of his Holy Word: Since there is no less than a whole *Chapter*, the Fourteenth of the First *Epistle* of *St. Paul* to the *Corinthians*, which treats purposely on this Matter, and plainly condemns this Practice. And this the *Apostle* doth in such plain and express Terms, that I cannot but wonder that any one who has read that *Chapter*, should justify that unreasonable Practice: But something they must say, when they are resolv'd to uphold it.

Now *N.C.* tells us, that there is no such thing as *unknown*, in all that *Chapter*; but the Word is added by the Translators of the *English Bible*, how truly we shall soon see: And this *First*, From the usual Signification of the Word in the *Original*; and *Secondly*, From the Scope and Design of the whole *Chapter*. And *First*, From the usual Signification of the Word in the *Holy Scripture*. Now the Word in the *Original* which is translated

* *unknown Tongue*, has several Significations; sometimes 'tis taken for the Faculty of Speaking, sometimes for the Peculiar Language of every Nation, but generally for *unknown Tongues*. And since this Word has divers Significations, we must be determin'd, as to its Meaning here, by considering the Design of the *Text*, and of the whole *Chapter*.

And here I agree with my Author, that by *Tongues* in this *Chapter* are meant, that extraordinary and surprizing Gift of Tongues, wherewith the first Believers were inspired by the Holy Ghost; who infus'd into them the Ability of Speaking in different Tongues, such as they who spoke them never learnt, but were understood by those who heard them. For the Apostles being sent by our Blessed Saviour, to propagate the Gospel thro' the whole World; and it being necessary that they should Preach the Gospel to every People in a Tongue which they understood; and impossible that they should learn all those Languages in a Natural Way, in so

* Πᾶσαν γλῶτταν βασιάνιζε, omnem dicendi facultatem excute. *Aristoph.*

Γλῶσσης χαρυσίῃ, forma sermonis unicuique genti peculiaris. *Herod.*

Ἀγνωστοῖσι τῷ γλῶσσῳ, ignoto sermone utentes. *Thucyd.*

Γλῶσσην φήγησις, interpretatio vocum obscuriorum. *Galenus.*

small

small a time; God was pleased to supply this Natural Defect, by the Extraordinary Assistance and Inspiration of his Holy Spirit: So that in whatsoever Country or Nation they came, they were enabled to speak readily in the Language of that Country, and were plainly understood by the Hearers; which was necessary to their reaping Benefit by their Prayers and Preaching. Again, the Apostles being oftentimes call'd to speak to a mixt Multitude, consisting of many People and Nations, who did not understand the Language which the Apostles naturally spake, nor one another, nor had any one common Language between them: It pleased God to inspire the Apostles after so miraculous a manner, that tho' they spake but one Tongue, yet it was as effectual as if they had spoken many; and every particular Hearer heard the Word Preach'd in his own Tongue, which he naturally understood. And this I take to be the meaning of the Gift of Tongues: And if so, then what N. C. affirms cannot be true; *That this extraordinary Gift of Tongues, was given rather as a Sign to the Unbelievers, than for the Instruction of the Faithful.* That this is a gross Mistake, is evident from the Design of this Chapter; which is to show, That tho' the speaking in *unknown and strange Tongues*, was useful
for

for the speedy Conversion of Unbelievers, yet when us'd for the Instruction of the Faithful, (call'd Propheſying) 'twas much more beneficial to the Church. And therefore the Apoſtle adviſes them rather to covet Propheſying, (*i. e.*) Interpreting the Holy Scriptures to their Hearers, than Speaking with Tongues; becauſe tho' the firſt might raiſe the greater Admiration and Veneration to their Perſons, yet the other was of more general Uſe, and tended more to the Edification of the Church. This being the true Notion of Speaking with Tongues, 'tis plain, that Praying in a Tongue which the Generality of the People do not underſtand, is expreſſy contrary to the Deſign of the Apoſtle in this *Chapter*: For ſince there ~~was~~ but two Ends for which this Miraculous Gift was beſtowed upon the Church; the Conversion of Infidels, and the Strengthening the Faithful in their Holy Belief; neither of theſe can be obtain'd, in our Times, by Preaching and Praying in ſuch a Tongue, as the Generality of the People are ignorant of: And the Apoſtle tells us, That the End of all Publick Prayer and Preaching, ought to be the Edification of the Hearers; and that 'tis as abſurd to Pray or Preach in an unknown Tongue, as for a Trumpet to give ſuch an indifſinct Sound in the time of Battel,

that

that no body can tell the meaning of it, whether it betokens a Charge or a Retreat, *ver.* 8. In like manner, if we speak or pray in Publick, in a Language the People do not understand, they can neither join together in Prayer, nor say *Amen* to it; nor are they edified by the Preaching: This is so evidently the design and tendency of this Chapter, that one would think it needed no Comment. And if so, then N. C.'s Objections are of no force, That the Word in the Original is sometimes translated *Tongues* absolutely, and sometimes *unknown Tongues*; for since this Word is taken both ways in other Authors, there is reason that it should be so translated, and the Sense of the Place, and the Coherence with what goes before and what follows, must determine when 'tis to be taken in one signification and when in the other; and that 'tis thus duly and properly translated, any one of competent Knowledge and Learning may easily judge. Thus I think it is as clear as Noon-day, from Antiquity, Reason, and the Holy Scripture, That the Publick Service of the Church ought to be offer'd up in a Tongue which the People understood. But to leave them no manner of excuse, I will consider what they say for themselves, and with what Fig-leaves they cover this unfound Part.

And

And, *First*, *N. C.* tells us, 'That the
 ' performance of the Publick Offices of
 ' the Church in one common Tongues
 ' contributes very much to *foment* the
 ' Union of the Church": To *foment a*
Union is a very odd expression; (and in-
 deed *N. C.* is very unhappy in his Expres-
 sions thro' the whole Book, tho' I have
 not thought it worth my while to take no-
 tice of them). Well, but (passing over
 the absurdity of the Expression) how doth
 it contribute to the Union of the Church
 to have the Publick Offices of Religion
 perform'd in the same Tongue in all the
 Nations of the World? Methinks, if they
 were perform'd in never so many Lan-
 guages, if there were but care taken, that
 they were such as no body understood,
 they would have the very same Effect.

'But, says *N. C.* all the Members of
 ' the *Catholick Church* ought to have Com-
 ' munion and Fellowship one with ano-
 ' ther; they should all be united in one
 ' Faith, and one uniform Worship of one
 ' God; they ought all to be qualified for
 ' the Participation of the same Sacrament,
 ' and to assist together at the Publick Di-
 ' vine Service where ever they meet; else,
 ' how can the Unity of their Faith and
 ' Communion subsist?" In which words
N. C. seems to affirm, That all Unity, whe-
 ther of Worship or Faith, depends on the
 having

having one common Language in our Publick Devotions; as for the Unity of Faith, 'tis evident, Men may believe the same Creed, tho' they make use of a different way of Worship, much more when they use the same Form of Worship, tho' in a different Tongue; and as for the Unity of Worship, that doth not depend on the serving God with the same Tone of the Voice, or making the same Sound, but in offering up to God the same devout Affections, in joining together in the same Prayers and Praises, and in addressing our selves to God after the same manner, with one Heart and with one Voice. Now, how can this be perform'd when the generality of the People do not understand the Tongue, in which the Publick Offices of Religion are perform'd? And when they are said in *so low a Voice*, that very few, even of those who are present, can hear them. And, to use N. C.'s own words, which immediately follow this Objection, and are a sufficient answer to it; 'For how, says he, can I join in Prayer, or in God's Publick Worship, with any Society of People, when I cannot discern by any thing they do or say, whether they are *Catholicks* or *Hereticks*? or, how shall I receive the Sacrament in the Society of those, who for any thing I can see or understand, may
'be

' be *Jews*, or Blasphemers of my Holy Re-
 ' ligion"? Thus N. C. has given a suffi-
 cient Answer to himself, like one of those
 little waspish Animals, who carry in their
 Tails an Antidote for their own Sting.
 Had he as good a knack in proving as in
 answering what he says, he would be a
 much more formidable Adversary; but
 how he will make out what immediately
 follows, I cannot imagine: That the per-
 forming the Service in *Latin*, is the Bond
 that unites and cements all the Members
 of Christ's Mystical Body; and that the
 whole Frame of the *Catholick Church*
 would dissolve and fall to pieces, if this
 were taken away. I suppose he must
 mean, that it unites the Members of the
Romish Church in Ignorance, which, as
 they tell us, is the Mother of Religion
 and Devotion. But farther, N. C. tells
 us, ' That the difficulty of translating the
 ' Liturgy into Vulgar Languages, and
 ' preserving it in its Purity, is enough to
 ' dissuade us from the Undertaking; and
 ' that the Uniformity of the *Liturgy* is the
 ' best standing Monument we have of the
 ' Faith and Practice of our Ancestors; 'tis
 ' it that shews us, how they us'd to Ad-
 ' minister the Sacraments, and what sorts
 ' of Ceremonies they judg'd most proper
 ' to excite and stir up Devotion, and to
 ' perform God's Service with that Gravi-
 ' ty

ty and Decency suitable to his Holy Religion; and that if it were translated into Vulgar Languages, it would require frequent Alterations and Changes, and be the cause of endless Disturbances.

To which I answer, That it plainly appears from the *Liturgy* of the *Church of England*, which was compiled One hundred and forty Years ago, and yet retains its Primitive Purity, without any considerable uncouthness of the Phrase; that the Publick Prayers may be translated into such Sterling Language, and such Simplicity of Expression, as may continue a long while without any need of Alteration; and that if once in a Century a few words were chang'd, it would not cause any Commotions or Disturbances, nor any alteration in the Sense.

And that 'tis very true, that the Uniformity of our *Liturgy* is of excellent use, and cannot be sufficiently commended. But when N. C. says, 'tis the best standing Monument we have of the Faith and Practice of our Ancestors, he should have made an Exception of the Holy Scriptures. But can he be so stupid as to think, that this Uniformity doth consist only in the Uniformity of Language? Doth he not know, that 'tis a Uniformity of Doctrine, a Uniformity of Heart, of Voice, of Rites and Ceremonies, which is so proper

I

per

per to excite and stir up Devotion ; which we may have, nay, which is much better obtain'd, when the Publick Prayers of every Nation are translated into that Language, which is most commonly and familiarly us'd by the People who inhabit it ; whereas Prayer in a Foreign Tongue is of no use, 'tis a *mocking of God*, and giving the People a Stone instead of Bread.

This, I think, is all that is material to be said on this Subject ; I pass on to another notorious Abuse, which has obtain'd in the *Church of Rome*, and very near akin to it, and is treated of in the same Chapter.

The *Papists* are charg'd by *His Grace*, that they lock up the *Holy Scriptures* in an unknown Tongue, and forbid the common People the use of them.

To this Charge *N. C.* replies, ' That 'tis wholly groundless and notoriously ' false, and unworthy the Character and ' Reputation of *Dr. Tillotson* ; that 'tis as ' clear as the Sun at Noon-day, that the ' *Papists* have the Scriptures in all the ' Vulgar Languages spoken in those Parts ' of the World where they live ; that the ' *Doway Bible* and *Rhemish Testament* are ' common, and in the hands of the People, as also the *French Bible* ; and that ' in *Spain*, *Germany*, and *Italy*, the People ' have the Scriptures in the Vulgar Languages.

To

To this I answer, *First*, That those Translations which have been made of the *Bible* into the *Vulgär Tongue*, were forc'd from them; for when they found that the People could not be with-held from reading the *Bible*, and looking into those Translations which the *Protestants* had publish'd, they thought it would be better to let them have one of their own dressing up; and they have provided such Translations as run directly contrary to the Original, and have foisted into them so many Popish Tenents, and have inserted so much of their own Superstition, that they have turned this wholesome Food into deadly Poison; an instance of which we have in that *Bible* printed at *Bordeaux*, A. D. 1686.

Secondly, The common People are not permitted to read any * Translation but their own, nor these Translations without License; and to obtain a License, a Man must *first*, have the Consent of his Parish-Priest; *secondly*, the Leave of the Bishop and the Inquisitor must be asked;

and

* Cum experimento manifestum sit, si Sacra Biblia Vulgari Lingua passim sine discrimine permittantur, plus inde detrimenti quam utilitatis oriri ob hominum temeritatem; hac in parte Judicio Episcopi aut Inquisitoris stetur: ut cum consilio Parochi vel Confessarii Bibliorum à Catholicis Authoribus verborum lectionem in Vulgari Lingua eis concedere possint, quos intellexerint ex hujusmodi lectione non damnum, sed fidei atque pietatis argumentum capere posse: quam facultatem in scriptis habeant. De Lib. Prohib. Reg. 4.

and this must be under his Hand in Writing; and this is never granted, but only to such Persons as they are very secure of, such as do not design an Increase of Knowledge, but only of Faith and Piety. So that a Licence, with all these Limitations, is no Licence at all. And then, let any one judge, whether the Council of *Trent* (to which he appeals) *doth not in the least favour* the locking up the *Holy Scripture* from the People. 'Tis certain, that our Saviour made no such *Limitations*, in whose time, *the Poor had the Gospel Preached unto them.*

Thirdly, They allow of no Interpretation of the Holy Scriptures, but what is put upon it by that Church, *i. e.* the Church of *Rome*. So that for a Private Person to be too prying and Inquisitive into the Meaning of the Holy Scripture, especially into any Point of Controversy, is the way to have his Licence (which is revocable) taken from him; and 'tis well if he escapes the Inquisition, if he be
an

That is, since 'tis evident from Experience, that if the *Sacred Bible* were permitted indifferently, and without distinction, to be read in the *Vulgar Tongue*, such a Liberty (by reason of Mens Rashness) would produce more hurt than good; be it therefore left to the Bishop's or Inquisitor's Judgment, by and with the Advice of the Parish Priest, or Confessor, to give leave to read the *Versions* of the *Bible*, translated by *Catholic Authors* into the *Vulgar Language*, to such Persons, who, as they shall determine, will not receive Prejudice, but an increase of Faith and Piety thereby.

an Inhabitant of the *Popish* Countries; tho' to those in *England* they may be more favourable, because they cannot help it.

Lastly, To make all sure, (for tis'ten to one but Truth will out, and 'tis a very difficult matter to conceal it in such Prying Times) they prefer Unwritten Traditions before the Word of GOD; and N. C. tells us so, and gives us this Reason for it: " That Christ our Lord commanded his Disciples to go and Preach the *Gospel*; but we do not find, that he gave any Injunction about giving his Word in Writing to the People, in order to learn their Faith. As if committing the *Gospel* to Writing, was not as much Preaching of it, as declaring the Contents of it to the People with their Voice.

And now having (as I think, made good this Assertion, That the *Papists* lock up the Holy Scriptures in an *unknown Tongue*) I hope there needs not much to be said to prove, That they are guilty of a heinous Sin, and a sacrilegious Theft in so doing; and therefore I shall only quote a Passage out of one of *His Grace's Sermons*, Vol. I. *post obit.* pag. 160. ' The like may be said of Locking up the Scriptures, from the People in an *unknown Tongue* ' contrary to the Command of the Scriptures themselves, and to the great End

' and Design of Almighty God in the
 ' Writing and Publishing of them; and
 ' contrary to the perpetual Exhortations
 ' and Counsels of all the Antient Fathers
 ' of the Christian Church for a great
 ' many Ages, not one excepted. They are
 ' hardly more frequent, and copious, and
 ' earnest in any Argument, than in per-
 ' suading People of all Ranks and Con-
 ' ditions, to the constant and careful
 ' Reading of the Holy Scriptures. And
 ' contrary to the Common Reason and
 ' and Sense of Mankind. For what should
 ' Men be persuaded to be acquainted
 ' withal, if not with that which is the
 ' great Instrument of our Salvation? That
 ' Book which was written on purpose to
 ' reveal and convey to Men the Knowledge
 ' of God, and of his Will, and their Duty?
 ' What should Men be allowed to know,
 ' if not that which is the best and most
 ' effectual Means to direct and bring them
 ' to Heaven; or turn them from Sin, and
 ' to preserve them from Eternal Misery?
 ' When our Saviour would represent the
 ' best and most effectual Means of bring-
 ' ing Men to Happiness, and saving them
 ' from Eternal Torments of Hell: In the
 ' Parable of the Rich Man and *Lazarus*,
 ' he brings in *Abraham*, giving the best
 ' Advice he could to the Rich Man, who
 ' was in Hell, concerning his Brethren
 ' who

' who were upon Earth, how they might
 ' prevent their coming into that Place of
 ' Torment; and he directs them to the
 ' Scriptures, as the best, and most effectual
 ' Means to that Purpose: *They have*, says he,
 ' *Moses and the Prophets, let them hear them;*
 ' *for if they hear not Moses and the Prophets,*
 ' *neither would they be persuaded, tho' one rose*
 ' *from the dead.* And now one would think,
 ' that the declared Judgment of our Saviour
 ' should go a great way, even with the
 ' most Infallible Church in the World.
 ' However, this we must say, that 'tis a
 ' very hard Case to which the Church of
 ' Rome hath reduced Men; that it will
 ' neither allow them Salvation out of their
 ' Church, nor the best and most effectual
 ' Means of Salvation when they are in it.
 In which words, *His Grace* has excellent-
 ly display'd, not only the great Use and
 Benefit of Publishing the Bible in a
 Tongue that the People understand; but
 also the Reasonableness and Necessity of
 so doing. Let us see now what Pleas
 N. C. and others make in Defence of the
 contrary Practice in the Church of *Rome*.

And *First*, He tells us, ' That Dr. *Tillot-*
 ' *son*, and his Party, are of all others the
 ' unfittest to reproach the *Papists* with this
 ' Conduct; considering, that most of the
 ' Learned Men of his Church do inge-
 ' nuously own, That the Promiscuous Use

‘ of the Scripture allowed to all sorts of
 ‘ Persons, and their Private Interpretations
 ‘ thereof, was in a great Measure the Cause
 ‘ of all the different Sects, that sprang up,
 ‘ and divided themselves from their Com-
 ‘ munion; which is an Assertion absolutely
 false; and would become any one better,
 than one who pretends to write, *A*
True and Modest Account, &c.

I desire him to read these Words of the
 Archbishop, which will make him blush, if
 he has any *Modesty* left. *Vol. III. pag. 492.*

“ They, (*i. e.*) the *Papists* say, that Peo-
 “ ple are apt to wrest the Scriptures to
 “ their own Destruction; and that the
 “ Promiscuous Use of them, hath been the
 “ great Occasion of Heresies. It cannot
 “ be deny’d to be the condition of the
 “ best things in the World, that they are
 “ liable to be abused; Health, and Light,
 “ and Liberty, as well as Knowledge.
 “ But must all these therefore be taken
 “ away? This very Inconvenience of
 “ People’s Wrestling Scripture to their
 “ own Ruine, *St. Peter* takes notice of in
 “ his days; but he doth not therefore
 “ forbid Men the Reading of them, as his
 “ more Prudent Successors have done
 “ since. Suppose the Reading of the
 “ Scriptures hath been the Occasion of
 “ Heresies: When were there ever more,
 “ than in the First Ages of Christianity?
 “ and

“ and yet neither the Apostles , nor their
 “ Successors ever prescrib’d this Remedy.
 “ But are they in earnest ? Must not Men
 “ know the Truth, for fear of falling in-
 “ to Error ? Because Men may possibly
 “ miss their Way at Noon-day, must they
 “ never travel but in the Night, when
 “ they are sure to lose it ?

“ And when all is done , *THIS IS*
 “ *NOT TRUE* , that Heresies have
 “ sprung from this Cause ; they have ge-
 “ nerally been broach’d by the Learned,
 “ from whom the Scriptures never were,
 “ nor could be concealed. And for this,
 “ I appeal to the History and Experience
 “ of all Ages. And then he quotes
 St. *Chrysostome*, and St. *Hierome*. This Para-
 graph N. C. could not but take notice of;
 but I suppose he thought fit, *to silence the*
Truth here too ; because *it was not to his*
Purpose , of traducing *His Grace* , and the
 rest of the Learned and Reverend Divines
 of the *Church of England* : Which tho’ it
 could not escape the knowledg of any
 ingenuous and considerate Reader , yet
 this, and a great deal more may be swal-
 lowed down by such weak and credulous
 People , who too often become a Prey
 to the Missionaries of the *Church of Rome*.

I could quote a great deal more to the
 same Purpose, but then I must transcribe
 the greatest part of some of his Sermons ;
 and

and therefore I shall refer the Reader to *Serm. 12. Vol. IV. and Vol. III. Serm. 12.* where he will find this Subject (as indeed all the rest are) excellently treated on; I shall only make one Quotation more; because it will shew us the true Cause why the *Papists* are such irreconcilable Enemies to the Holy Scriptures. *Vol. III. Pag. 483.*

“ Doth not our Blessed Saviour exhort
 “ the *Jews* to search the Scriptures? and
 “ *St. Paul* charges the Christians, that the
 “ *Word of God should dwell richly in them;*
 “ and the ancient Fathers of the Church
 “ frequently and earnestly recommend to
 “ the People the Reading and Study of
 “ the Scriptures: How comes the Case
 “ to be so altered? Sure the Word of
 “ God is not chang’d, *that certainly abides*
 “ *and continues the same for ever.* Was
 “ not the Old Testament publish’d in a
 “ Language understood by the People;
 “ and the *Epistles* of the *Apostles* by the
 “ Churches to whom they were written;
 “ and the *Gospels* both by *Jews* and
 “ *Greeks*? Were there no Difficulties
 “ and Obscurities then in the Scripture,
 “ capable of being wrested by the unstable
 “ and unlearned? Were not the People
 “ then liable to Error, and was there no
 “ Danger of Heresie in those Times?
 “ And yet these are the great Objections
 “ against

“ against putting the Scriptures into the
 “ hands of the People ? Which is just
 “ like their arguing against giving the
 “ Cup to the Laity, from the Inconve-
 “ niency of their Beards, lest some of the
 “ Consecrated Wine should be spilt upon
 “ them : As if Errors and Beards were
 “ Inconveniencies lately sprung up in the
 “ World, and which Mankind were not
 “ liable to in the First Ages of Christia-
 “ nity.

“ But, says *His Grace*, in truth all their
 “ Objections are level’d against the Holy
 “ Scripture itself; and that which the
 “ Church of *Rome* would find fault with,
 “ if they durst, is, That there should be
 “ any such Book in the World, in the
 “ hands either of *learned* or *unlearned*;
 “ for if it be dangerous to any, none are
 “ more capable of doing Mischief with
 “ it, than Men of Wit and Learning.
 “ And this is evident, by the Advice
 “ given to Pope *Julius III.* by the Bishops
 “ met at *Bononia*: *That as little of the*
Gospel as might be, especially in the Vulgar
Tongue, should be read to the People; for
say they, This is that Book, which above all
others, hath raised those Tempests and Whirl-
winds which we were almost carried away
with. And in truth, if any one diligently
considers it, and compares it with that which
is done in our Church, he will find them very

contrary to each other; and our Doctrine to be not only very different from it, but repugnant to it. “ If this be the Case, (as the Archbishop goes on) they do like the rest of “ Children of this World, prudently “ enough in their Generation: Can ~~we~~ “ we blame them for being against the “ Scriptures, when the Scriptures are “ acknowledged to be so clearly a- “ gainst them? But surely no body who “ considers these things, would be of “ that Church; which is brought by the “ undeniable Evidence of the Things “ themselves, to this shameful Confession; “ That several of their Doctrines and “ Practices are directly contrary to the “ Word of God.

Secondly, N. C. says, That the *Popish* Religion is under Persecution, in most *Protestant* Countries; that all the Marks of Infamy and Dishonour are put upon them, being not permitted to bear any Civil and Military Office; nay scarce allow'd in some Countries, to exercise such honest Professions or Callings, as may enable them to get their Bread; That they are rail'd at in the Pulpits by *Protestant* Ministers; and such false and ridiculous Tenents ascrib'd to them, as inflame the People's Hatred, and give them a perpetual Aversion to them and their Religion. And that if the *Test* and
Penal

Penal Laws were taken away, which (as he says) are the *Fences* and *Bulwarks* of the *Protestant Religion*, it would soon fall to Pieces, and these Prodigal Children return to their Mother, the Church of *Rome*.

But certainly *N. C.* cannot be ignorant, nor forget, what Usage the *Protestants* have met with in *Popish* Countries, and what they still undergo; how many Thousands of them have been Murder'd, and sent to Heaven in a Fiery Chariot; and what Cruelties have been practis'd upon their Bodies, Estates, and innocent Children; that they have been harrass'd with Dragoons, condemn'd to Imprisonment, and the Gallies; whereby their Lives have been render'd so miserable, that a speedy Death was much more desirable: These poor miserable Wretches, who were guilty of no Crime but their Religion, would have look'd upon it as a peculiar Favour, to have underwent the worst Sufferings the *Papists* are liable to amongst the *Protestants*. Cruelty and Persecution, meerly for Conscience sake, is contrary to the Spirit and Genius of the Gospel of Love and Peace: But seditious Practices against the State, endeavours of subverting the Fundamental Laws of the Government, seducing Subjects from their Religion and Allegiance,

giance, are Crimes of so black and dangerous a nature, that they ought to be repressed by the Civil Magistrate, and if persevered in, severely punished. And such Crimes as these have been prov'd against those *Papists* who have suffer'd in *England*. And as for the *Test* and *Penal* Laws, 'tis but just and reasonable, that those who depend upon a Foreign Head, and have made over their Allegiance to another Government, should be excluded from having any share in ours.

And so little reason has *N. C.* to affirm, that the Protestant Religion is supported by Persecution of its Enemies, and by the Preferments in our Church; that it may with more Truth, be retorted upon the *Papists*, whose Religion permits them to accommodate themselves to all Humours and Capacities, to make use of pious Frauds, and notorious Impostures, *to silence such Truths as are not for their purpose*, and (if 'tis for the good of the Church) to conceal even the Profession of Christianity. it self; So that from these, and many more such instances, 'tis very reasonable to conclude, That did the *Papists* but understand the Principles and Practices of their own Church, and was their Religion but set in a true Light before them, and they left at liberty to determine for themselves; that those who have Honesty and Judgment

ment sufficient to weigh and consider things, would rather chuse to be *Turks* and *Heathens*, than such sort of Christians as the Church of *Rome* teaches Men to be.

Of the Invocation of Saints.

THE *Invocation of Saints* is one of those Idolatrous Practices which we charge upon the Church of *Rome*, whereby they fall in with the superstitious Usages of Heathen *Rome*, who deify'd their deceas'd Princes and Benefactors; and therefore when the Archbishop treats of this Subject, 'tis no wonder that *he lays about him*, (as our Author tells us) *i. e.* takes a great deal of pains to convince his Hearers of the sinfulness of this Practice, and how much they displease God thereby, and hazard their eternal Salvation.

Of this *N. C.* seems to be sensible, and therefore he is wonderful cautious and wary in stating this Article of the *Papish* Faith. He tells us indeed from the Council of *Trent*, *That that which they hold to be of Faith, is, That the Saints, who reign with Jesus Christ, offer up their Prayers for Men;*

Men; that it is good and profitable to invoke them after an humble manner, and to have recourse to their Prayers, Aid and Assistance, to obtain of God his Benefits, thro' our Lord Jesus Christ his Son, our only Saviour and Redeemer.

But N. C. adds, ' That tho' the Council declares this to be the Faith of the Church concerning this Point, yet it does not command or oblige any of the Laity to pray to the Saints, or invoke them; that 'tis not absolutely necessary, and that the Church leaves every one at liberty to make use of it, or not : Nay, p. 230. he absolutely denies the Matter of Fact, and would bear us down; That the *Papists* only commemorate the holy Apostles, the blessed Virgin *Mary*, and the Saints, in the publick Service of the Church; but, says he, *we do not put up any formal Prayers to them.* Certainly N. C.'s Book was design'd for the use of very weak and ignorant Persons, or of such *Romanists* as have an implicate Faith for all that the Guides of their Consciences say; otherwise he could never imagine, that such notorious Falshoods, and evident Prevarications could pass upon any intelligent Reader; for tho' the *Papists* give up themselves to be led blindfold by their sagacious and infallible Guides, yet we *Protestants* take the liberty to make use of our Senses,

Senses, and to weigh things in the Balance of unprejudic'd Reason, and are not willing to pin our Faith, and the Hopes of our Eternal Salvation, on the Sleeves of any Guide, tho' he pretends to never so much Infallibility. And therefore I shall take the Liberty to compare N. with C. and to consider, whether 'tis possible to reconcile those Inconsistencies he is guilty of; for certainly never any Man had a better Title to that Character of *Martial*,

Nemo est tam prope, tam proculque sibi.

Well then, N. C. tells us, that the Church of *Rome* doth not command or oblige any of the Laity to Pray to Saints; but doth not their Church command the Laity to join in their Publick Worship, and are not the Prayers of the Saints a Part of their Publick Worship? This he confesses, but tells us, 'That in the Publick and Solemn Service of the Church, (excepting the Litanies of the Saints, which are read or sung solemnly four times a Year; the General Confession of Sins in the beginning of the Mass, a few Hymns, Anthems, and Versicles, read only once a Year) they put up no Prayers to Saints or Angels. What tripping is here? Would it not be more ingenuous and becoming an honest Man, to

K

tell

tell the plain Truth, without *silencing any part of it*? Let me therefore ask him this Plain Question, Do not the *Papists* Pray to Saints? Yes, this he tells us in the beginning of this *Chapter*, tho' he denies it in the latter part of it. Doth not the Church oblige the Laity to be present at the Publick Worship? This he cannot deny. Are not these Prayers part of their Daily Service, and particularly the General Confession? this is evident. Nay is not this one of the Articles of their Creed, without the Belief whereof *none can be sav'd*, that the Saints ought to be invocated and worship'd? This is clear, beyond all Question. And if so, why should they endeavour to cover, what they cannot possibly conceal? Would it not be much better to confess the Truth, and reform their Liturgy, rather than to persist in such Practices as they themselves are asham'd of, especially if it shall appear, that this Practice is downright Idolatry? And this will be very evident, from those Discourses *His Grace* has made upon this Subject; and then *N. C.* must acknowledge, that he had good reason *to lay about him*.

Now to make Proof of this, I shall consider what *His Grace* has said on this Subject. And first, he quotes *Coloss. 2. 18, 19.* where the *Apostle* says, *Let no Man*

Man beguile you of your reward, in a voluntary humility and worshipping of Angels, not holding the head. Which Text is the more remarkable, because the *Apostle* seems to have said these Words, that he might meet with that plausible, but irrational Excuse of the *Papists*, of *Praying to Saints*; That they think it more decent to pray to Saints to offer up their *Prayers* to God, than to go to God directly: For as 'tis usual to be introduc'd into the *Presence* of Great *Princes* by some Favourite-Courtier, and inferior Subjects never approach the Throne, but by the Mediation of some Officer or Attendant; so they think it would be Insolence, to offer up our *Prayers* and *Praises* directly to the Glorious Majesty of GOD, without the intermediate Intercession of some Angel or Saint. This is an old, tho' plausible Excuse, and therefore the *Apostle* exhorts the *Colossians* not to be beguil'd thereby; and tells them that those who under this Pretence of a Voluntary Humility, address'd themselves to Angels, should lose the Reward of their *Prayers*, (*i.e.*) God would not hear them; and that they did not hold the Head, (*i.e.*) they acted contrary to one of the *Fundamental Principles* of the *Christian Religion*; which teaches us to *Pray* to God alone, in the Name, and for the Sake of our Blessed Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ.

To this N. C. answers, ' That the Word
 ' *Worship* is us'd in Scripture and in com-
 ' mon Discourse, not only to signify the
 ' Supream Worship and Honour, we pay to
 ' Almighty God, but also all sort of Respect
 ' and Reverence done to Kings, Princes, and
 ' Persons of Condition. That of this we
 ' have many Examples in the Holy Scri-
 ' pture; and not only so, but the very
 ' Word, which we use to signify the Su-
 ' pream Worship due to God alone, is
 ' sometimes apply'd to Humane Affairs;
 ' the same Expression being us'd in *Latin*
 ' to God and our Parents, 'tis *colere Deum*,
 ' and *colere Parentes*; but translated dif-
 ' ferently, to worship God, and to honour
 ' our Parents. So that the Scripture will
 ' afford us sufficient Grounds for Worship-
 ' ping and Invocating not only God,
 ' Angels and Saints, but even common
 ' and ordinary Men.

This is true indeed, but nothing at all to
 the purpose; for 'tis certainly that Su-
 pream Honour and Worship which is due
 to God, which we *Protestants* say, and
 prove too, that the *Papists* give to Saints
 and Angels; or else 'tis a Worship so very
 like Divine Worship, that we know not
 how to distinguish between them. For 'tis
 evident, that they offer up to them the
 Sacrifice of Prayer and Thanksgiving; and
 that for this very Reason, because they
 look

look upon them to be Intercessors between God and Man; a Worship which is only due to that sole Mediator of the Second Covenant, our Saviour Jesus Christ. And that the Words bear this Sense, *Theodoret* tells us in his Comment upon them, who affirms, That we must send up our Thanksgivings to God and the Father, by Christ, and not by Angels. In which Words, the Worship of Angels by offering up our Thanksgivings and Prayers to them, is evidently decry'd, without any kind of trusting to their Merits, as *N.C.* would bear us in hand. For tho' the Church of *Rome* tells us of a Treasury of the Merits of the Saints, which indeed is properly so call'd, because it has brought an inexhaustible Fund of Wealth into the *Pope's* Coffers; yet I never heard of any Treasury of the Merits of Angels, till *N.C.* discover'd it; or, if there was any such, that it was design'd for any part of *St. Peter's* Patrimony.

This is also evident from that Canon of the Council of *Laodicea*, which enjoins, *That Christians ought not to forsake the Church of God, and go away from it, and to Invoke Angels, and to make Conventicles, all which are forbidden. If therefore any be found giving himself to this secret Idolatry, let him be Anathema; because he hath forsaken the Lord Jesus Christ the Son of God, and is gone over to*

Idolatry. And that by this *secret Idolatry* in the Canon, is meant Prayer or Invocation of Angels, is plain from the Words of *Theodoret*, when he quotes this Canon, in his Comment on the Third of the *Colossians*, vers. 17. where he tells them, *That because several Hereticks did command Men to Worship Angels, he enjoins the contrary; that they should adorn both their Words and Actions with the Memory of the Name of Christ their Lord; and send ye up (saith he) thanksgiving to God and the Father by him, and not by Angels.* And then speaking of the Canon of the Council of *Laodicea*, he adds; *Which in pursuance of this Rule, and being desirous to Cure that Old Disease, made it a Law, that none should Pray unto Angels, or forsake our Lord Jesus Christ.* Which lets us into the true Meaning of that other Sentence which *N. C.* quotes from *Theodoret*; viz. *We do not address our selves to the Saints as Gods, but we pray unto them as Divine Men, that they would please to be Intercessors for us: i. e.* We desire the Saints or holy Men, to intercede with God for us in this World; but we do not make Gods of them, by Praying to them after they are departed this Life. These things being consider'd, I think *His Grace* had Reason to be warm, (as *N. C.* expresses himself) when he discourses on these Matters of so near Importance; and has made

made use of so much Argument, as well as Rhetorick, that N.C. will never be able to gainsay it; tho' he may go on to Prevaricate; for which, I pray God he may obtain Pardon in this World, lest it should be too late to ask it in the next.

Secondly, His Grace reasons thus: That 'tis evident from the nature and reason of the thing it self, that there can be but one *Mediator* and *Intercessor* in Heaven, who offers up our Prayers to God; because under the Gospel there being but one High-Priest, and but one Sacrifice once offer'd for Sin, and *Intercession* for Sinners being founded in the Merit and Virtue of the Sacrifice, by which expiation for Sin is made, there can be no other *Mediator of Intercession*, but he who hath made expiation of Sin by a Sacrifice offer'd to God for that purpose, and this *Jesus Christ* only hath done; he is both our High-Priest and our Sacrifice; and therefore he only, in the Merit and Virtue of that Sacrifice which he offer'd upon Earth, can intercede in Heaven for us, and offer up our Prayers to God, and procure the Acceptance of them; for that can only be done in virtue of a Sacrifice first offered, and by him that offered it, this being the peculiar Office and Qualification of a *Mediator* and *Intercessor*, properly so called. And this *His Grace* proves at large from the

Epistle to the *Hebrews*, which seems chiefly design'd to make good this Truth.

To this N. C. replies, and acknowledges, 'That 'tis true, that *Christ* only has a right and title to *mediate* and *intercede* for us, because he alone paid the Ransom and full value of our Sins, and therefore may in Justice ask of his Father to forgive us; but tells us, that we ought to distinguish between an *Intercession* founded in Justice and Equity, and an *Intercession* founded only in Favour and Goodwill, (*i. e.* if I understand him right,) that tho' *Jesus Christ* alone has received Power and Authority to obtain of God the Remission of our Sins by virtue of his Merits, yet the Saints and Angels, out of their great Love to Mankind, may entreat and beseech him to do the same, and are permitted by God so to do.

But since this *Intercession* is founded neither in Justice nor Equity, but in meer Favour, therefore 'tis but reasonable that there should be some plain Revelation to confirm us in the belief, and engage us to apply our selves to the Practice of it: For till God has told us so, we have no reason to conclude, that God will confer this Favour upon Saints and Angels, especially since he is not oblig'd either in Justice or Equity so to do. God has confer'd this Honour upon his only
be-

begotten Son, and made him the only *Mediator* between Mankind and Himself; he sent him into the World for this very purpose; and our Saviour was pleased to take upon himself our Nature, that he might be capable of this Mediatorial Office; and, why should we think that God will make Saints and Angels Partners with him, or give this Honour to any other? Has he given us any intimation of this in the Holy Scriptures? or, Has he any where enjoined us to address our selves to those inferior Deities? or, Have we the least hint of any such Practice in the First Ages of the Church? or, Is not our Blessed Saviour sufficient to hear all our Prayers, to retain the Sense of all our Wants, and to offer up to his Father all our Petitions and Thanksgivings? This *N. C.* was sensible of, and therefore he owns, that the Saints and Angels cannot be term'd *Mediators* and *Intercessors* in the same Sense in which *Christ* is our *Mediator*; but they are call'd so in a lower and improper sense, because they pray to God for us.

But this Answer is very much besides the purpose; for *His Grace* doth not blame the *Papists* for making the Saints *Intercessors* in this improper Sense, *i. e.* by praying for us, but because they would have them to be so in a true

true and proper Sense, and hereby intrench upon Christ's Mediatorial Office, who alone has undertaken to offer up our Prayers and Praises unto God, and by virtue of his own Merits, to render them acceptable unto him. And therefore we have no reason to take N. C.'s word, when he tells us, 'That whether the Archbishop calls them *Intercessors* in a proper or improper Sense, 'tis all one to him, 'since *His Grace* acknowledges, they do 'pray for us, and *intercede* with God in 'our behalf, he is satisfied, for he is sure 'the *Papists* desire no more of us. What, no more than our Brethren upon Earth can do? They can pray to God for us, and *intercede* on our behalf, but they cannot offer up our Prayers to God, and procure the Acceptance of them: But this, and more, the *Papists* require of the Saints. And therefore,

Thirdly, The Archbishop had good reason to find fault with the Bishop of *Meaux's* Exposition of the Doctrine of the *Romish* Church, when he tells us, *That they pray to the Saints in Heaven, in the same order of Brotherly Society with which we entreat our Brethren upon Earth to pray for us.* For this is not a true Representation of their Doctrine, as will appear from these following Considerations.

1. Because they pray to the Angels and Saints in Heaven, with the same solemn Circumstances of Religious Worship, that they pray to God himself.

2. That in their Prayers and Thanksgivings, they join the Angels, and the Blessed *Virgin*, and the Saints, together, with God and Christ.

3. That in the Creed of Pope *Pius IV.* it is expressly said, *That the Saints which reign with Christ, are to be worshipp'd and Invoked.*

4. That in the Publick Offices of the *Romish* Church, they do not only pray to the Saints to pray for them, but they direct their Prayers and Thanksgivings immediately unto them, for all those Blessings and Benefits which they ask of God, and thank him for.

To which *N. C.* replies, ' That there never was a Book more universally commended and approved in the *Latin* Church, than the Bishop of *Meaux's* Exposition of the Doctrine of the Catholick Church, that the *Pope*, and *Cardinals*, and *Consistory*, approved of it, &c. So that to say, this Exposition is not a true Representation of the Doctrine and Practice of the *Roman Catholick Church* in this matter, is as unreasonable in it self, as it is injurious to that Great and Learned Prelate, and to the whole *Catholick Church*, which hath approved it. This

was

This is so high an Encomium of the Bishop of *Meaux* (who is certainly a very deserving Person) that Infallibility it self could not lay claim to a greater ; and 'tis a thousand pities this Learned Prelate was not chosen *Pope*, that the *Papists* themselves at least might have had an Infallible Judge to determine all those Controversies, which abound amongst them, and to mollifie their hard Tenents to a sense as near as possible to the *Protestant Faith*. We should be very willing to take him at his word, and the *Popish Faith* upon his credit, if we had good reason to believe it would pass current ; but 'tis very suspicious, that those who are very good *Catholicks* in *Protestant Countries*, according to the Bishop of *Meaux's* Exposition, would in some *Popish Countries* be burn'd for Hereticks.

But whatever Opinion *N. C.* may have of the Bishop of *Meaux*, yet there are others who think, that at least in this particular, *Bellarmino* understood the Doctrine of the *Romish Church* as well as he : And from this Great Champion of the *Remish Cause*, we may learn, That the Saints which reign with *Christ* in Heaven, are Gods by Participation, (*i. e.* a sort of inferior Deities, such as the Heathens suppos'd their Mediators to be,) and that therefore we may flee to their Aid
and

and Help, as well as to their *Intercession* and *Prayers*. Upon which, *His Grace* makes this Reflection, ' That certainly, ' either *Bellarmino* hath raised the Saints ' in Heaven too high, when he makes ' them Gods by Participation ; or the ' Bishop of *Meaux* hath sunk them too ' low, when he thinks they are to be ' treated and address'd to, *in the same order of Brotherly Society* with mortal Men ' here upon Earth. But to come to the matter in hand :

First, The Archbishop proves, that the Bishop of *Meaux* misrepresents the Doctrine of the *Romish Church* ; because the *Papists* pray to Saints and Angels in Heaven, with the same solemn Circumstances of Religious Worship, that they pray to God himself, in the same Place, and the same humble Posture, and in the same religious Offices and Services, in which they pray to God, which is never done by any to their Brethren upon Earth.

To which *N. C.* replies, ' That the ' *Papists* address no Prayers to Saints or ' Angels in the Publick Service of the ' Church, but that all their Prayers are ' directed to God only ; and as to their ' Posture in the Church, or at their private Devotions, whether kneeling, or ' standing, or bowing, they declare their ' intention is to adore God alone, and ' none

'none else. Which is so grossly and so evidently false, that I shall not mistrust my Reader's Judgment so far, as to imagine he can be in any danger of being impos'd upon thereby : For 'tis evident, that they do not only address themselves to Saints and Angels in their Religious Worship; but also that

2. They join the Angels, and the Blessed Virgin, and the Saints together, with God and Christ in their Prayers and Thanksgivings, as if (to use their own Phrase) *it were in the same order of Brotherly Society*, and as if they were all equally the Objects of our Invocation and Praise; nay, they do not only in their Publick Offices join the Blessed Virgin, with God and our Saviour, but sometimes put her before her Son, and say, *Let Mary and her Son bless us*; and nothing is more frequent in their eminent Writers, than to join them together in their Doxologies and Thanksgivings, *Glory be to God, and the Blessed Virgin, and Jesus Christ*, says Gregory de Valentia. And Bellarmine himself concludes his Disputations concerning the Worship of Saints, in these very words, *Praise be to God, and to the Blessed Virgin Mother Mary, likewise to Jesus Christ, the eternal Son of the eternal Father, be Praise and Glory*. And in the very Roman Missal it self, they make
Con-

Confession of their Sins, to God Almighty, and the Blessed *Virgin Mary*, to *St. Michael* the Archangel, and to all the Saints. And in their Absolution, they join together the Passion of our Lord *Jesus Christ*, and the Merits of the Blessed *Virgin*, and of all the Saints, for the Remission of Sins.

To which *N. C.* replies, 'That 'tis true 'the *Papists* do join God and the Saints 'together in the same breath, and that 'they are taught by the Holy Scriptures 'so to do; of which he gives us several Instances, as *1 Kings*, 12. 18. *The people greatly feared the Lord, and Samuel.* *Acts*, 15. 18. *It seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and to us.* *1 Tim.* 5. 21. *I charge thee before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, and the elect Angels.* *Rev.* 1. *St. John* writes to the Seven Churches in *Asia*; *Grace be unto you, and peace from him which is, and which was, and which is to come; and from the seven Spirits, which are before his throne; and from Jesus Christ.* *1 Chron.* 29. 20. *The congregation blessed the Lord God of their fathers; and bowing their heads, worship'd the Lord and the King.*

But none of these Instances come up to the Point; for the Archbishop doth not blame them only for joining God and the Saints together in the same Breath, for there is no harm in this; but because they
make

make God and the Saints Joint-Objects of Divine Worship : They do not only mention their Names, and bow down to them at the same time , but they pray unto them for the same things , and address themselves to them in the very same manner. So that there is no means to distinguish the Worship of one from the other. And as for the last Instance , 'tis not evident from the Text , that they *bowed down to God and the King* at the same time ; for in the *verse* before , the King commanded the People to bow down to God , which they did ; and then made their Obeisance to the King : And from thence can only be concluded , that the same Word is applied to both Acts , tho' with different Degrees of Honour. And now let me put N.C. in mind , that the *Romish Church* in general , and himself in particular , has very great need to take back again the good Counsel he gives to the Archbishop ; and to weigh and consider well , what sort of Worship they offer up to God ; ' and not to exhibit such Ridiculous Scenes , (to use his own Words) as make the Religion of *Jesus Christ* a Theatre of Laughter and Sport : For , *God will not be mocked.*

3. In the Creed of Pope Pius IV. 'tis expressly said , *That the Saints which reign together with Christ , are to be worship'd and invo-*

invocated; but this they will not allow to be done to our Brethren upon Earth.

But N. C. is positive, That *this is only to be understood in the same Order of Brotherly Society, in which we worship and reverence our holy Brethren on Earth, upon account of their Piety and Virtue, and in which we intreat them to Pray for us:* But if so, why doth he not give us the Reason why the Council of *Trent* grounds the Invocation of Saints, upon their Reigning with Christ in Heaven? For this shews, that this *Worship and Invocation of Saints* must necessarily be something more; for otherwise this Reason would be frivolous, if the same thing may be done to our Brethren upon Earth. Nay this Council admonishes us, *ad eorum Orationes, Opem, Auxiliumque confugere*; to fly to their Prayers, Aid, and Help: And in the *Catechism* which was made by Order of that Council, we are taught, That 'tis lawful to ask of the Saints, that they would have Mercy upon us; and the Reason is given, because they are very Merciful. And if so, where lies the difference between their Prayers to God, and to the Saints? If 'tis neither in the Matter of them, nor in the Form, nor in the Reason of them: If we Pray to them for the same Thing, and in the same Form, *Have mercy upon us; and our*
L Pray.

Prayers to the Saints be grounded on the same Reason, that our Prayers to God are, namely, because they are Merciful. Where then is the Difference between them ?

Let us consult the Publick Offices of the Church of *Rome*, and we shall find, that they do not only *Pray to the Saints*, to *Pray for them*; but they direct their Prayers and Thanksgivings immediately to them, for all those Blessings and Benefits which they ask of God, and thank him for.

To which *N.C.* answers, by denying the Matter of Fact; and fixes it as an indelible Mark of Insincerity on the Archbishop; that he affirms it, and endeavours by Foul Play (as he calls it) to uphold a sinking Cause: Nay he challenges any Man to find so much as one single Prayer, either in the *Missal* or *Breviary*, which is directed to Angel or Saint, for all those Benefits and Blessings which we ask of God, and thank him for: And says, That that Prayer to the Angels which *His Grace* instances in; viz. *Deliver us, we beseech you, by your Command, from all our Sins*, is not to be found in the Publick Office of the *Blessed Virgin*, annex'd to the *Breviary*.

But all this is but quibbling and banter. For doth not he himself confess in two or three places of this very Chapter, that in
the

the Litany of the Saints, and in the General Confession they do pray to Saints? Do they not pray to St. *Michael*, *Holy Michael*, *defend us in Battel*, *that we perish not in the dreadful Judgment*? And as for that particular Passage the Archbishop quotes, he cannot deny that 'tis in the Office of the *Blessed Virgin*, tho' he doth not find it in that Office annex'd to the *Breviary*. And here I cannot but stand amazed at the Insincerity of the *Popish Priests*; Insincerity shall I call it; 'tis a *hard Word* indeed, but not hard enough for those who would bear us in hand, that they do not Pray to Saints and Angels; and that only (as they would have it) they desire them to pray for them; when not only their Private Forms of Devotion are stuff'd with such Blasphemous Expressions, as would make one's Ears tingle to hear them, (and yet they do not use any Means to suppress them:) but also their Publick and approv'd Forms of Prayer abound with many Instances, of direct Invocation both of Saints and Angels. For is there not in the very *Breviary* itself, restor'd according to the Council of *Trent*, and authoriz'd by three several *Popes*, in the Feast of the *Assumption* of the *Blessed Virgin*, these Words: *Vouchsafe to let me praise thee, O Holy Virgin, and give me Strength against my Enemies*? Is

the not intreated, *To loose the Bands of the Guilty, to give Light to the Blind, to drive away our Evils, and to shew herself to be a Mother ? Or, as it is in the Mass-Book, Printed at Paris, 1634. By the Authority of a Mother, command the Redeemer :*

O *foelix Puerpera,*
Nostra pians Scelera,
Jure Matris impera
Redemptori.

Which I find thus rendred into *English :*

Sweet Lady, Mother of the Son,
Who hath all our Sins foredone;
Out of thy Mother's power, we pray thee,
Command thy Son for to obey thee.

This certainly is not to pray to her, to pray to God for us; but to pray her to order and command him what he shall do for us. In a word, they pray to her for *Purity of Life, and a safe Conduct to Heaven.* And in the Feast of *St. Maria de Nives;* To help the Miserable, to strengthen the Weak, to comfort those that Mourn, and that all who celebrate her holy Festivity, may feel her Assistance. Thus in the Hymn to the Holy Apostles, they beseech them, *To command the Guilty to be loosed from their Guilt, to heal unsoand Minds, and to increase*
their

their Virtues ; that when Christ shall come, they may be Partakers of Eternal Glory. Nay they make the Virgin Mary to be much more merciful than our Redemer himself; for thus prays Pope Innocent III. in the Hymn of Christ and the Virgin:

*Precor te, Regina Cæli,
Me habeto excusatum,
Apud Christum tuum gnatum;
Cujus iram pertimesco,
Et furorem expavesco.*

These Instances may suffice, for the present, only for a Taste of the *Sincerity* of these Guides; who would bear us down, and think it a strange thing, that we will not believe them, and take their bare Words for it; That the Church of *Rome* doth not require of any one, nor practise any more, than *to Pray to the Saints, to Pray for them.* But suppose this was so, yet,

4. The Archbishop urges, That thus to Pray to the Saints at all Times, in all Places, and for all sorts of Blessings; doth suppose them to have the Incommunicable Perfections of the Divine Nature inherent in them, or imparted to them; *viz* Omnipotence, Omniscience, and Omnipresence.

In this Argument, *N. C.* confesses there is great Difficulty, and that he must be at some Pains to answer it; and I think so too, and that he must take a great deal more Pains than he has done in the former Part of his Book, to effect it.

Well then, in order to do this, he lays down these Grounds.

First, That Saints and Angels can understand our Thoughts and Prayers at the greatest distance, as well as if they were present with us; and that being Pure Minds, there is requir'd no proximity of Place, to converse with us.

Secondly, That God Almighty is able to reveal in an instant all the Desires of our Hearts, and Prayers to them.

And be but so good natur'd, as to give him these Concessions to set his Foot upon, and then he will soon move this Weighty Argument, which otherwise I fear will be too hard for him.

For how doth it appear, that Saints and Angels understand the Thoughts of our Hearts, and the Desires of our Souls? I am sure the Holy Scripture tells us, that God alone is the Searcher of the Heart; and if so, how can they know them at a distance? But much more difficult will it be to explain, how they can discern the Thoughts of a thousand Persons, in different Places, at the same Time, with-

out

out partaking of that Omniscience, which is an Incommunicable Attribute of the Divine Nature.

But being beat from this Hold, I suppose he will say; 'That tho' the Saints cannot hear all our Prayers, yet God can reveal them to whom he pleases; and then there will be no necessity, that we should attribute the Divine Perfections to them.

But not to dispute what God can do, where doth *N. C.* give us so much as the shadow of a Reason to prove that he will do so? Nay 'tis highly probable that he never design'd it; because he has constituted a Mediator on purpose, to receive our Prayers, and to make them an acceptable Sacrifice unto him, thro' his Merits and Mediation. And as *His Grace* reasons, 'If the Saints must have a Revelation from God of our Prayers, before they know what we pray to them for; then the shortest and surest way is to pray to God, and not to them: Or however, (as *Bellarmino* confesses) it were very fit to pray to God, before every Prayer we make to the Saints, that he would be pleas'd to reveal that Prayer to them; that upon this Signal and Notice given them by God, they may betake themselves to pray to God for us. But unless it were very clear from Scripture, that God had appointed this Method; it is in

Reason such a way about, as no Man would take that could help it : And it seems to me, to little purpose : For why should not a Man think God as ready to grant him all his other Requests, without the *Mediation* and *Intercession* of Saints, as this one Request of revealing our Prayers and Wants to them ? And, if this way be not thought so convenient, I know but one more, and that is, to pray to the Saints to go to God, and beg of him that he would be pleas'd to reveal to them our Supplications and Wants, that they may know what to pray to him for in our behalf, which is just such a wise course, as if a Man should write a Letter to his Friend that cannot read, and in a Postscript desire him, that as soon as he had receiv'd it, he would carry it to one who could read, and intreat him to read it to him.

Lastly, To address our selves to Saints and Angels, is to be guilty of the same *Idolatry* the *Heathens* were, who worship'd God by innumerable Mediators, by Angels, and the Souls of their departed Princes and Heroes.

To this *N. C.* answers, ' That in order to remove this Difficulty, we ought to take a view both of the Character and Worship which the *Heathens* gave to their *Pagan* Saints, and see whether upon the
' Com-

Comparison, the *Christian* Saints be in any thing by us treated like them.

First, As to their Character, *N. C.* tells us, ' That the *Heathens* gave these Saints the Attributes of the Supream Being, that they were guilty of all manner of Lewdness, Intemperance, and Debauchery : But the *Christian* Saints are of another Complexion ; The *Papists* (he says) give them none of the Attributes of the true God, that they were the Instruments of God in working Miracles, and that all their Sufficiency is from God ; and that as to their Lives, they were holy and pure, which makes their Character as different from the *Pagan* Saints, as white is from black.

Secondly, As to their Worship ; ' The *Heathens* worship'd their Gods, or *Pagan* Saints upon a false pretence of their Power and Greatness in Heaven ; whereas there were no such Saints. But we honour and respect the *Christian* Saints, because we are warranted by the Word of God, that they are such as we represent them. The *Heathens* erected Altars to their Gods ; but we make Altars for none, but one God only. They offer'd Sacrifice to all their Gods and Saints, which is the chief Mark of Supream Worship ; but we offer Sacrifice only to the true and living God, as Malice it
self

' self cannot deny. They made Idols,
 ' and believ'd that their Gods came and
 ' dwelt in them; but we only put up in
 ' our Churches the Images and Pictures of
 ' *Jesus Christ* the living God, and of such
 ' as we are sure are truly Saints, but do not
 ' worship them for their own sakes, or be-
 ' lieve there is any Divinity in them, but
 ' that the Respect which we shew them is
 ' to be refer'd to the Originals, namely,
 ' *Christ* and his Saints. So that upon the
 ' whole, the Doctor might as well resem-
 ' ble Sea to dry Land, as the Worship we
 ' give to *Christian* Saints, to that which
 ' the *Heathen* paid to their Heroes or
 ' Saints, as the Doctor calls them.

This is what *N. C.* says in defence, or
 rather to palliate that Idolatrous Worship
 which the *Church of Rome* gives to Angels
 and Saints; and yet, after all he has said
 to this purpose, if we will take the pains
 to consider it, we shall find, that one Egg
 is not more like another, than the *Popish*
 Saints are to the *Heathen*, as has been
 made out beyond Contradiction, by se-
 veral of our Learned *Protestant* Writers.
 'Twould be too long and tedious a task
 to draw an exact Parallel between them;
 and therefore I shall only make a few
 plain Remarks on what *N. C.* has said,
 which may be of use to the less curious
 Reader; referring the Inquisitive, for far-
 ther

ther satisfaction, to those just Treatises which have been publish'd on this Subject.

And, *First*, N. C. tells us, 'That the *Heathen* gave their Saints the Attributes of the Supream Being; but the *Papists* do not impute to their Saints any of the Attributes of the true God.

What he means by the *Heathens* giving their Saints the Attributes of the Supream Being, I cannot well tell; and indeed, there is such an impropriety of Expression runs thro' the whole Discourse, that (unless N. C. is a Foreigner) 'tis unpardonable in one who pretends to so much Reading and Learning, which I the rather remark, because I have been frequently oblig'd to transcribe his very words. But I suppose, by the *Heathens* giving their Saints the Attributes of the Supream Being, he must mean, That tho' the *Heathens* did generally believe that there was one Supream Being, yet they attributed to their inferiour Deities, or *Pagan* Saints, those Divine Perfections (such as Omnipotency, Omniscience and Omnipresence) which were the incommunicable Attributes of God: But the *Papists* do not think their Saints have any of those inherent Perfections, but derive all their Power and Sufficiency from God.

But,

But, *First*, 'tis evident, That tho' the *Heathens* did worship the Sun, Moon, and Stars, their Heroe's and Benefactors, and departed Princes, as an inferior sort of Deities, yet do we not find that they attributed to them those Divine Perfections which were originally inherent in the Supream Being. They worship'd the Host of Heaven, supposing the Stars to be animated with Divine Understandings; and they look'd upon the Planets as Mediators between God and Men; and that they were all inhabited by such spiritual Intelligences, as were of a middle nature between the uncreated and created Beings: And as for their Heroes and deceas'd Princes, they acknowledged them to have been mortal Men, who for the Benefits they did Mankind, and for their Wisdom, were made immortal Deities, who had the Government of this lower World committed to them. And as they were inferior in their Nature to the Supream Being, so those Perfections, they were possess'd of, were of a lower Kind, and only Streams deriv'd from this Fountain.

And just such sort of Beings do the *Papists* hold their Saints to be; an inferior sort of Deities to whom the Supream Being communicates the Transactions of this lower World, and gives them Power and
Efficacy

Efficacy to help those who pray unto them, and devoutly worship them.

Secondly, N. C. says, 'That the *Heathen* Saints were guilty of all kinds of 'Licentiousness and Debauchery, but the '*Christian* Saints are pure and holy Beings, 'Men who laid down their Lives for the 'Truth of the Christian Religion.

But this is nothing to the purpose; for the Charge of Idolatry will lie upon every one who pays Divine Worship to a created Being, tho' never so good, tho' the most perfect Saint, or the most glorious Archangel; for the Question is not concerning the Quality of the Object of our Worship, but whether our Worship is suitable to its Object?

And as for the *Romish* Saints, 'tis certain, that they were not all endow'd with those good Qualities N. C. so much glories in; some of those whom the *Pope* has thought fit to make Saints, were not the best of Men, as *Thomas Becket*, and *James Clement*, and *Ignatius Loyola* himself. Several of their Saints are very probably thought to have been only the Product of some Poet, or Painter's luxuriant Fancy; as *Time* is painted like an Old Man wing'd, with a Scythe, and *Justice* with a pair of Scales: So *St. Christopher* and *St. Margaret* were only Hieroglyphical Representations of the different State
of

of *Christians* in this World; the one being only the Representation of a *Christian* passing over a Land-flood, carrying *Jesus Christ* on his Back, who did burthen him, but yet conducted him; the other of a Woman attack'd by the Devil, but gaining the Victory, and trampling him under her Feet. And generally of all their Saints, there are such fulsome Stories told, so inconsistent with any shew of Truth, as are sufficient to disparage those which are best attested; and tho' the bare rehearsing them would seem too light and ludicrous in a serious Discourse amongst *Protestants*, yet are they firmly believ'd in *Popish* Countries.

But, *Thirdly*, *N. C.* tells us, ' That there ' is a great Difference as to the Worship of ' them; the *Heathen* Saints were worship'd ' upon account of their Power in Heaven ' who never were there. And may not this be said of several of the *Popish* Saints too? The *Heathens* erected Altars, and offered Sacrifice to their Saints; and do not the *Papists* do so too? Do they not offer up unto them the Sacrifices of Prayer and Thanksgiving, which certainly are more acceptable to the Supream Being than any other Sacrifices can be? The Devotion of our Hearts must needs be a more precious Offering than any outward Sacrifice; and therefore *St. Austin* speaking of
the

the Sacrifice due to God, makes our Hearts the Altar, and Christ our Priest, and our Prayers and Praises offer'd up to God by a fervent Charity, to be a true Sacrifice. So that (to use the Words of a Learned Prelate,) 'tis evident, That on the same account that the *Heathens* did give Divine Honour to their inferior Deities, those in the Church of *Rome* do so to Angels and Saints: For the *Heathens* made a difference between their Sacrifices to the Supream God, and to their inferior Deities and Heroes; so that if the putting any difference in the way of Religious Worship doth excuse the one, it must do the other also. Did the *Heathen* use solemn Ceremonies of making any capable of Divine Worship? So does the Church of *Rome*. Did they set up their Images in Publick Places of Worship, and kneel before them, and invoke those represented by them? So does the *Roman* Church. Did they consecrate Temples, and erect Altars to them, and keep Festivals, and burn Incense before them? So does the *Roman* Church. Lastly, Did they offer up Sacrifices in ~~in~~ those Temples, to the Honour of their lesser Deities and Heroes? So does the *Roman* Church. For *Bellarmino* reckoning up the Honours belonging to canonized Saints, besides those before-mentioned,

tioned, reckons up this as one, That the Sacrifice of the Eucharist, and of Lauds and Prayers are publickly offer'd to God, *for their Honour.*

Lastly, N.C. says, they do not call the Saints Gods ; but this is nothing to the purpose ; for if they worship them as such, if they offer up to them their Sacrifices, Prayers, and Praises, they do much more. For the Name of God is attributed in Scripture, to those who were no Gods ; but the Worship of God cannot be given to any Created Being, without being guilty of the same Idolatry the Heathens formerly were ; and I think this is very evident, from what has been already said.

I shall close up this *Chapter* with that Remark, which *His Grace* makes at the end of the *Third Sermon* of the *Second Volume*, Publish'd *post Ob.* That this Practice of Praying to Saints was first Establish'd about the Eighth Century ; at the same time with the Worship of Images, and when the first Foundation of Transubstantiation was laid : And as they began at the same time, so it is very fit, and 'twould conduce very much to the good of the Church, if they were taken away together.

Of IMAGES.

THERE were two sorts of *Idolatry* the *Heathens* were guilty of, both of which we charge upon the Church of *Rome*. *First*, That they give that Divine Worship to Saints and Angels, which ought to be given to God alone. *Secondly*, That they worship the true God by visible Symbols and Representations, such as *Images* are. The first I have treated of in the former *Chapter*, the other I shall make the Subject of my present Enquiry.

Now N.C. tells us, that the Council of *Trent* declares, *That the Images of Christ, of the Virgin-Mother of God, and of all other Saints are to be had, and kept, especially in Churches, and that due Honour and Respect is to be given them: Not that we believe any Virtue or Divinity to be in them, for which they ought to be worship'd; or that we should ask any thing of them; or put any trust or confidence in them, as was formerly done by the Gentiles, who put trust in Idols; but because the Honour due them, is refer'd to the Originals, which they represent. So that by those Images which we kiss, and before which we uncover our Heads, and bow down,*

M

we

we adore Christ, and reverence the Saints, whose likeness they bear.

This is that State of the Case the Council of *Trent* has given us, tho' a very confus'd and partial one : For it only declares, that we must give *due Honour* to the Images of Christ and the Saints, but what that *due Honour* is, it doth not determine; nor doth it distinguish between that Honour which is to be given to the Image of God, and that which is to be given to the Image of the Saints; or whether both alike : These were some parts of the Truth, which the Council thought fit to *silence*; and are Difficulties so abstruse, that they could not be determin'd by Infallibility itself; and yet till they are determin'd, the Decree of the Council about the Worship of Images, is insignificant, and to no purpose.

However taking this Doctrine in the gross, we have one Plain and General Argument against Worshipping of Images; because (as *His Grace* tells us) this Doctrine is as point-blank against the second Commandment, as a deliberate and malicious killing of a Man, is against the sixth.

To which N. C. replies; ' That if
' he means by Worship, to give the
' Supream Worship and Adoration to Images, which is due only to God, he is
very

‘very much in the right, and I hope he shall
 ‘never be contradicted by me. But if he un-
 ‘derstands by *Worship*, to give *Images* that
 ‘*Honour* and *Respect* which is due to things,
 ‘that represent *Jesus Christ* and his *Saints*,
 ‘he is contradicted by *Scripture*, by all An-
 ‘tiquity, and even by his own *Church*. So
 that he would have us believe, that the
Papists do not give any *Divine Worship* at
 all to *Images*, but only that *Honour* and
Respect which is due to things which
 represent *Jesus Christ* and his *Saints*.

But that this is a false Representation
 of the Practice of the *Papists*, will become
 very plain, by considering,

First, That the *Papists* do not only make
Images of the *Saints*, and *Jesus Christ*, as
 Man, but of God himself; and this *N. C.*
 tells us in plain terms: *We*, says he, *make*
only the Images and Pictures of the true God,
and the Saints, Pag. 265. and this is so
 commonly practis’d, that they do not only
 place them at the beginning of their *Bibles*,
 but they hang them up for *Signs*, at their
Doors and *Inns*; so that I have heard of
 some who travel’d in *Italy*, that they have
 lodg’d at the *Trinity*, and set their *Horses*
 at *God’s Head*: This is a Practice so ridicu-
 lously prophane, that one would not men-
 tion it, were it not to shame them out of
 their *Impieties*.

2^{ly}, They give the same *Worship* to the
Images, as they do to those things which

those Images represent, and therefore to the Image of God they must give Supream Worship and Adoration. For since (as they tell us) the Worship they give to Images, doth not terminate in the Image, but in that thing of which the Image is only the Representation; and as the Council of *Trent* says, *The Honour done to them, refers to the Original they represent; and that by bowing down and worshipping them, they adore Christ and God.* Therefore they must give to the Images of God and *Jesus Christ*, Supream Worship and Adoration.

But, say the *Papists*, ' We do not give ' this Divihe Worship to these Images, ' (which are only Stocks and Stones, the ' Work of Men's Hands) as the Heathen ' did; but we give Divine Worship unto ' God, by and in these Images; we pro- ' strate our selves indeed before them, ' but God alone is the ultimate Object of ' our Worship.

But pray let me ask *N. C.* one Question or two: Do they give any Worship or Honour to the Image itself, by which God is represented? And if so, Is it that Worship which is due to God, or an Inferior sort of Worship? An Inferior sort of Worship it cannot be; because the Council of *Trent* tells us, That all Honour done to Images, is refer'd to the Original which they

they represent ; and therefore since these Images represent God, the Supream Worship due to God, is by them given to these Stocks and Stones, as they tell us the *Heathens* formerly did , which is the grossest Idolatry in the World.

This, I think, doth naturally follow from those Principles which the *Papists* make Profession of. But however, since they generally disclaim the Paying of any Divine Worship to the Images themselves, we will in Charity grant them so much, and admit their Plea : That they only Worship God in, by, or thro' those Images and Representations which they make of his Divine Being. But yet this being admitted, it will do them very little Service. For 'tis evident, That this Worshipping of God in, by, or thro' any Visible Representation, is directly contrary to the Second Commandment.

Now the Commandment itself is very plain in this Matter; and so plain, that we can hardly imagine how it could be set down in more intelligible and express Terms. Yet to put it out of all Question, *Moses* himself gives this Explanation of it; Levit. 26. 1. *For, says he, you shall not make you any Idol or graven Image, neither rear up a standing Image; neither shall ye set up any Image of Stone in your Land, to bow down to it; for I am the Lord your God.*

To which the *Papists* reply, ' That the Word translated * *Image*, ought to be render'd *Idol*; and that 'tis translated by the *Seventy*, by a † Word of the same Signification; and that then this Commandment will be levell'd against the idolatrous Practices of the *Heathens*, who worship'd the Images themselves, and not against those *Christians* who only worship God by and thro' them.

But this Shift will be of no use to them, because 'tis plain, that the Word which in this Commandment is translated *Image*, in the proper signification of it, doth denote any * *Image* which is carv'd, or cut out of Wood or Stone; and thus 'tis generally render'd by the LXX, at least forty times; and but thrice otherwise. And as for this particular place, 'tis evident it ought to be render'd *Image* here, because 'tis explain'd by a † Word that follows, which signifies any likeness or similitude whatsoever. We are forbid not only the making *graven Images*, but also *the likeness of any thing*, &c.

But farther, That this is the true Sense of the Commandment, will appear from the Reason which is given of this Law, which the Scripture informs us was deriv'd from God's spiritual and incom-

* *Pefel*. † *Εἰδωλον*. * *Γαυπίζω*. † *Themuna*.

prehensible Nature ; for as *His Grace* argues, ' Because God is a Spirit, therefore ' we are not to liken him to any thing ' which is corporeal ; we are not to represent him *by the likeness of any thing that is in Heaven above, i. e. of any Birds; or in the Earth beneath, i. e. of any Beasts; or in the Waters under the Earth, i. e. of any Fish.* For as the Prophet tells us, there is nothing that we can liken God to, *Isa. 40. 18. To whom will ye liken God ? or, What likeness will ye compare unto him ?* We debase his spiritual and incorruptible Nature, when we compare him to corruptible Creatures, *Rom. 1. 22, 23. St. Paul speaking of the Heathen Idolatry, who professing themselves wise, became fools ; and changed the glory of the incorruptible God, into an Image made like to corruptible Man, and to Birds, and to four footed Beasts, and creeping Things, says, They became Fools ; i. e. This is the Folly of Idolatry, to liken a Spirit, which hath no bodily Shape, to things that are corporeal and corruptible.* So that however some are pleas'd to mince the matter, I cannot see how the Church of *Rome*, which worships God by or towards some Image or sensible Representation, can be excus'd from Idolatry ; and the Church of *England* doth not, without just cause, challenge

M 4

' lence the *Romish* Church with it, and
 ' make it a ground of Separation from
 ' her. And since we *Christians* under the
 Gospel, have clearer Discoveries of God's
 spiritual Nature than the *Jews* ever had,
 we shall be far more unexcusable, if we
 do not offer up to him a more spiritual
 Worship. And if Perfection of our Chri-
 stian Worship doth consist in the spiritua-
 lity of it, that it is the Worship of our
 Souls and of our most devout and fervent
 Affections, how can it be imagin'd, that
 an Image should contribute any thing
 to the raising the Affections? Will not
 such a Worship by visible Representati-
 ons, rather incline us to entertain low
 and mean Thoughts of God, and bring
 down our *Idea's* of him to the Figure
 and Lineaments of a Man? And if the
 best *Idea's* or Notions we can frame of
 God, are unworthy of him, and infinite-
 ly below the Excellency of his Nature,
 how careful ought we to be, that we
 do not imagine him to be such an one,
 nay, worse than our selves? And to this
 purpose, when this Commandment was
 enforc'd on the People of *Israel* by a
 particular caution, *Deut. 4. 15, 16. Take*
ye therefore heed to your selves, lest ye
corrupt your selves, and make you a graven
Image, the similitude of any Figure, &c.
 the ground of that Caution is express'd
 in

in these Words, *For ye saw no manner of similitude on the Day that the Lord spake unto you :* Which evidently shews, that God will not be worship'd by any manner of similitude ; for otherwise, he would have appear'd in that shape or likeness to them, if he had thought it agreeable to the Excellency and Dignity of his Nature.

But that the worshipping God by an Image, is not lawful ; nay, that 'tis downright Idolatry, is evident from several Instances recorded in the Holy Scripture. I shall instance in that Calf which *Aaron* made in the absence of *Moses*, and those which *Jeroboam* set up in *Dan* and *Bethel* ; the worshipping of which , is generally agreed to be Idolatry : That the Worship of the Calf which *Aaron* made was Idolatry, is evident from 1 Cor. 10. 7. where the Apostle exhorts the *Corinthians*, *Neither be ye Idolaters, as were some of them, as it is written ; the People sat down to eat, and to drink, and rose up to play ;* that is, that their celebrating a Feast in honour of this Calf, was Idolatry : And this Text is the more remarkable, because the Apostle here exhorts *Christians* to take care that they were not guilty of the same Crime , lest they should incur the same, or more grievous Punishments. And that this Idolatry did consist in worshipping the

the true God by this visible Representation, is as evident, because in either of these Cases, 'tis incredible that the *Israelites* should so soon have forgot the true God, and that when the Golden Calf was set up, *Exod. 32. 4.* they cried out, *This is thy God, O Israel, who brought thee out of the Land of Egypt; and Aaron built an Altar before it, and made Proclamation, and said, To morrow is a Feast to the Jehovah, or the Lord:* Now the Name *Jehovah* is never attributed in the Holy Scripture to any but the true God. And to close up all, the Burnt-offerings, and Peace-offerings, were the same which God in the Law commanded to be offered up, a Bullock and seven Rams; the offering of which, was the greatest Affront imaginable to the Religion of the *Egyptians*, as is evident from *Exod. 8. 16.* From this and a great deal more, which might be said on this Subject, it plainly appears, That the worshipping God by an Image, or visible Representation, is that Idolatry which the Children of *Israel* were charg'd with, and guilty of.

And therefore I shall only strengthen and confirm what I have said by one Observation more; That even that Idolatry which the *Heathens* were guilty of, was the same with the *Jews*, and that which is the crying Sin of the Church of *Rome*

at

at this Day. For there were few of them so foolish and stupid as to believe, that those Stocks and Stones which they worshipp'd, were the Gods who created the World, or that the Leeks or Onions which they planted, were the supream Deities; no, this extravagant Idolatry is peculiar to the Church of *Rome*; first, to adore their God, and then to eat him: But the Heathens treated the meanest of their Deities after another manner.

Porum & Cæpe nefas violare, & frangere morsu.

Tho' they declar'd as the *Papists* do, That their Images were Symbols or Representations of that Being to which they gave Divine Worship; and that none but a Fool could think otherwise of them, as * *Celsus* declares. That they never thought their Images to be Gods, or to have any Divinity in them, but what only comes from their Consecration to such a use; and, as † *St. Austin* tells us, that thro' these Images they worshipp'd the Deity. Moreover, says * *Maimonides*, as to what concerns Idolaters, you know that none of them worship the Idol with this Opinion, as if they thought there were no other

* Apud Origen, l. 7. p. 373. † *St. Austin*. Tom. 8. in Psal. 113. * *More Nevochim*. ch. 36.

God but that: Nay, there never was any Man, nor will there ever be, who can fancy to himself, that the Figure which he hath made of Metals, Wood or Stones, created the Heavens and Earth, and governs them: But they worship them, inasmuch as they look upon them as Things intermediate between them and God. And to name no more, *Julian* tells us, We do not think them Gods, but that thro them we may worship the Deity; for we being in the Body, ought to perform our Service in a way agreeable to it.

But may some say, If the *Heathens* did not make their Images the ultimate Objects of their Worship, why then do the Scriptures so often accuse them for adoring Stocks and Stones, and for paying Divine Worship to Devils?

To which I answer, That they are justly accus'd for worshipping all these, because they made them either the Mediators between them and the Supream Being, or the Mediums by which they offered up their Worship, and hereby transferr'd the Worship, due to God alone, to these Idols, as the *Papists* at this Day do.

Well, but *N. C.* tells us, That even *Protestant* Writers, and some Learned Men in our Church, do allow, some Honour and Respect is due to the Images of Christ and the Saints; and he instances in the ingenuous

genuous Author, as he frequently calls him, of the *Answer to the Bishop of Meaux*, who says, ' We will honour the Relicks of the ' Saints, as the Primitive Church did; we ' will respect the Images of our Saviour, ' and the Blessed Virgin; and as some of ' us now bow towards the Altar, and all ' of us are enjoined to do so at the Name ' of *Jesus*, so will we not fail to testifie ' all due Respect to this Representation.

To which I answer, That Images are either such as represent God, and these are utterly unlawful to be made, or sold, or expos'd to publick View; or else, such as represent some visible Being; and these we may make, and are useful, as Ornaments to such Places, where they are not abus'd to Superstition or Idolatry: But even these cannot lawfully be worship'd with any sort of Divine Worship, nor any that comes near it, or gives any reasonable cause of suspicion of it, (nor doth that Learned Author allow of it.) because, as God himself gives the Reason in this Commandment, *God is a jealous God*; for, as he forbad *the having any other Gods besides himself* in the First Commandment, because *he is the Lord our God*; so in the Second, he forbids *the Worshipping of Images*, because *he is a jealous God*; so that tho' the *Papists* do not pay Divine Worship to their Images, yet if *their Eyes are after their Idols*, if they kiss them, and bow

bow down unto them; a jealous God will never suffer such Testimonies of Kindness. God will not be mov'd by their Distinctions of Relative, Inferior, and Improper Worship, by which they may prove either Side of the Question; and answer this, as some of the Church of *Rome* in *Scotland* did the Question, *Whether the the Lord's Prayer might be used to the Saints?* That ultimately, principally, primarily, and strictly, they might not; but secondarily, less principally and largely, and relatively they might; as Bishop Andrews tells us. *Answ. to Peron*, pag. 59. But to return into the Way from whence we have diverted; *His Grace* tells us, That the most Learned Men in the Church of *Rome* do acknowledge, that they ly under the just suspicion, and probable Charge of *Idolatry*; because they give this Reason, why the Worship of *Images*, and the Invocation of *Saints* departed, were not practis'd in the Primitive Church, for the First Three Hundred Years. ' That the Primitive Christians did ' then forbear those Practices, because they ' seem'd to come too near to the *Heathen* ' *Idolatry*, and lest the *Heathen* should ' have taken occasion to justify themselves, ' if those things had been practis'd among ' the *Christians*: And they cannot now ' be ignorant, what Scandal they give by
these

these Practices both to *Jews* and *Turks*,
 and how much they alienate them from
Christianity by this Scandal: Nor can
 they chuse but be sensible, upon how
 great Disadvantage they are, in defend-
 ing these Practices from the Charge of
Idolatry: And that by all their blind
 Distinctions, with which they raise such
 a Cloud and Dust, they can hardly make
 any plausible and tolerable Defence for
 themselves, against this Charge: In
 so much, that to secure their own Peo-
 ple from discerning their Guilt in this
 Matter, they have been put upon that
 shameful Shift of leaving out the Second
 Commandment in their common Cate-
 chisms and Manuals; lest the People,
 seeing so plain a Law of God against so
 common a Practice of their Church,
 should upon that Discovery have broken
 off from them.

Now to this last Charge of leaving out
 the Second Commandment, *N. C.* answers,
First, By denying the Matter of Fact; and
 says, 'That 'tis to be found in hundreds
 of Manuals and Catechisms, in England
itself; and that he has by him a Ma-
 nual and Catechism, which has this Com-
 mandment in it, in the same Form as it
 is in ours; and then breaks out into
 this intemperate and unbecoming Excla-
 mation: *Now a Man* (he means the
 Arch-

Archbishop) who can dispence with his Honour and Conscience, so far as to Publish from the Press and Pulpit, Untruths so easily discover'd, what Paradox may not he undertake to maintain? These are hard Words indeed, and one would think, that before he had given a Person of the Archbishop's Figure, such Rude and Scurrilous Language, and the downright Lye; he should have been well assur'd that he was on the right side of the Hedge, and that what he affirm'd was true; lest the Bolt which he shot up should fall upon his own Pate. For what was it that the Archbishop Publish'd from the Press and Pulpit? Was it, that the *Papists* had no Catechisms and Manuals in which the Second Commandment was inserted, especially in England? This he dares not affirm. Or is it not true, that *Papists* do frequently leave it out? This is evident, and that in some of their Manuals they mangle them so, that one cannot tell what to make of them, nor can the People reap any Benefit by them: Of this kind, the Reverend Mr. *Spinckes* in his Learned Answer to the Proposals for *Catholick Communion*, gives us an Instance of one which he has by him; where after the First Commandment, the rest are inserted thus: 2. Thou shalt not make. 3. Thou shalt not take. 4. Remember that thou keep, &c.

But

But Secondly, he says, *That what we call the Second Commandment, is in truth part of the First, and prohibits nothing but what the First prohibits, the having or worshiping more than one God.* But is not the having, and the worshiping more Gods than one, two different things? Besides, there is no Shew of Reason for dividing the Tenth into Two distinct Commandments, and making the Ninth to be, *Thou shalt not covet thy Neighbour's Wife;* and the Tenth, *Thou shalt not covet the other Possessions of thy Neighbour, as his House, his Servant.* For First, Our Saviour refer'd the Looking upon a Woman to Lust after her, to the Seventh Commandment: And Secondly, Moses, in the Twentieth Chapter of *Exodus*, reckons the Covering of the House first, and then of our Neighbour's Wife. So that if this Distinction had been genuine, the Ninth Commandment must have been included in the Tenth, which is not reasonable to suppose.

I think there is but one thing more, which N.C. says upon this Head, which deserves to be taken Notice of: He cannot gainsay, but that there are notorious and scandalous Abuses in the Worship of Images in the Church of Rome; but he doth not think it reasonable, that the Abuse of a thing should be urg'd as an *Argument* against the Use of it. Neither indeed ought it,

unless where the Abuse of it is so flagrant, and universal, and of more pernicious Consequence than the taking away of the Use of it can be: This was the true Cause of *Hezekiah's* destroying the *Brazen Serpent*; not that the People Sacrificed to it, and made it a God, as *N. C.* tells us, which no one can reasonably imagine of the *Jews*, who had been so long train'd up in the Knowledge and Worship of the true God; but that they made this the Visible Symbol of Worshiping the Invisible God; and paid that Divine Worship to it, and by it, which is due to God alone.

And thus the *Papists* are justly charg'd with worshiping a Crucifix, as is evident to any one who will give himself the trouble to look into their Missal; where there are so many Passages to this Purpose, that I cannot imagin with what Face *N. C.* could contradict what that Learned Author of the *Answer* to the Bishop of *Meaux*, affirms concerning it. I shall only transcribe a Passage or two. In the Order for Blessing a *New Cross*, after a solemn Consecration of it, by Incense, Holy Water, and Prayer; the Rubrick directs, That the Bishop kneeling before the *Cross*, should devoutly adore and kiss it. And in the Order for the *Solemn Reception* of an *Emperor*, that the *Cross* shall be carried on
the

the right side of the *Emperor's* Sword; because *Latria*, (*i. e.*) that sort of Worship which is particularly due to Almighty God, is to be given to it. 'Tis easie to give an Hundred more such Instances as these; and particularly, that in that very Place, 'tis *Adoramus eam*, (*i. e.*) *Crucem*; Let us worship the Cross. Which *N. C.* must needs know, and be very well appriz'd of: And therefore by that severe Sentence, which he so rudely and unjustly passes upon the Right Reverend Author of the *Answer* to the Bishop of *Meaux*, he must be condemn'd; it being very evident, *That tho' N. C. professes himself to be so great a Friend to Sincerity and Truth, yet he manifestly swerves from both in this Point.*

OF PURGATORY.

IN stating this Article of the *Popish* Faith concerning *Purgatory*, N. C. is very cautious, because he is sensible that 'tis burthen'd with such Difficulties, that no Fair Account can be given of it; either from Scripture, or Reason, or the Practice of the First Ages of the Church. And herein he follows the Steps of the Council of *Trent*; which declares only, *That the Souls there detain'd, are help'd by the Prayers of the Faithful, but especially by the acceptable Sacrifice of the Mass*: But doth not determine what sort of Place *Purgatory* is, or what manner of Pain Souls endure in it; or whether they are purg'd by Material Fire, or by other Terrors and Anguishes of Mind: These were Difficulties too knotty to be loos'd, and therefore both the Council and N. C. wisely pass them by; but tells us, 'That this Doctrine in General is founded in Scripture, and in the Antient Practice of the Church: And that *Praying for the Dead*, which was Practis'd in the Primitive Church, is an *unanswerable Argument* to prove, that they believed *Purgatory* too.

This

This he affirms indeed, with an Air of Assurance peculiar to himself; but however we have no Reason to take his Word for it, because he has so often broke it already. And therefore I shall consider what *His Grace* has said on this Subject; and in doing so, I shall return a sufficient Answer to *N. C.*'s *unanswerable* Argument.

And, *First*, *His Grace* affirms, That the Doctrine of Purgatory is not founded in Scripture, nor can be prov'd from it; and that some of their own eminent Men do acknowledge that it cannot.

To which *N. C.* answers, That he has produc'd two Passages from the Holy Scripture, and can produce many more which plainly prove it; and therefore he thinks he may safely tell the Doctor, *he is mistaken*. And because the Archbishop has not quoted any of their Learned Men, who say, That Purgatory cannot be prov'd from Scripture, therefore he takes it for granted, that he knew of none who do say so.

The two Texts of Scripture which he quotes, are, first, *Matth. 5. 25, 26.* *Agree with thy Adversary quickly, whilst thou art in the way with him: lest at any time the Adversary deliver thee to the Judge, and the Judge deliver thee to the Officer, and thou be cast into Prison. Verily, I say unto thee,*

Thou shalt not come out thence till thou hast paid the uttermost farthing.

These Words are spoke by our Saviour, to shew of what ill Consequence 'tis to harbour and indulge a malicious and an uncharitable Temper; as will appear to any one who reads the former part of the Chapter; and therefore he exhorts his Hearers *to agree with their Adversary quickly, whilst they are in the way with him, i. e.* to be reconcil'd to those with whom they have any difference; especially those they have wrong'd, whilst they are travelling on in this World, lest the Adversary commence his Suit against them, and they be cast, and then the Judge will deliver them to the Officer, *i. e.* the Devil, who is the Executioner of God's Vengeance, and they be cast into Hell, from whence there is no Redemption, *they shall never depart till they have paid the uttermost farthing.* And that by *the uttermost farthing* is meant Hell, and not Purgatory, is plain; because the *Papists* themselves grant, that those who are guilty of damnable and mortal Sins, do not go to Purgatory, but to Hell: Now this uncharitable Temper, against which our Saviour forewarns his Disciples, is confess'd on all hands to be a damnable Sin without Repentance; and the Parable supposes, that the Man did not repent of it, because he did not agree;

agree with his Adversary whilst he was in the way, *i. e.* in this Life. Nor do these words, *That he shall not come out till he has paid the uttermost farthing*, denote, that he may pay the Debt which he owes, or that there will be a time when he shall be releas'd from his Torments, as is evident from a parallel Place, *Matth. 18. 34.* where our Saviour says, *That the Lord of that Man who had not compassion for his fellow Servant, delivered him to the Tormentors, till he should pay all that was due unto him*; now that he could never pay this Debt is plain, because we are told, *ver. 25. that he had not to pay.*

The other Text which N. C. quotes, is *1 Cor. 3. 10, 11, &c.* *According to the Grace of God which is given me, as a wise Master-builder, I have laid the Foundation, and another buildeth thereon; but let every Man take heed how he buildeth thereupon. For other Foundation can no Man lay, than that which is laid, Jesus Christ. Now if any Man build upon this Foundation, Gold, Silver, precious Stones, Wood, Hay, Stubble, every Man's Work shall be made manifest; for the Day shall declare it, because it shall be reveal'd by Fire, and the Fire shall try every Man's Work of what sort it is. If any Man's Work abide, which he hath built thereupon, he shall receive a Reward. If any Man's Work shall be burnt, he shall*

suffer loss, yet he himself shall be sav'd, yet so as by Fire.

The meaning of which place, *His Grace* gives us in these words; The Apostle here speaks of a sort of Persons, who held indeed the Foundation of *Christianity*, but built upon it such Doctrines or Practices as would not bear the trial; which he expresses to us by *Wood, Hay, and Stubble*, which are not Proof against the Fire. Such a Person, the Apostle tells us, hath brought himself into a very dangerous State, tho' he would not absolutely deny the possibility of his Salvation; *He himself shall be sav'd, yet so as by Fire.*

'Tis evident, That by *Fire* here, is not meant the Fire of Purgatory, as some pretend, because the Particle of Similitude, (*ὡς*) plainly shews, that the Apostle did not intend an Escape out of the Fire literally, but such an Escape as Men make out of an House, or Town, that is on fire; especially, since very Learned Persons of the Church of *Rome* do acknowledge, that Purgatory cannot be concluded from this Text; nay, all that *Estius* contends for from this place, is, that it cannot be concluded from hence that there is no Purgatory; which we never pretended, but only that this Text doth not prove it.

It is very well known that this is a Proverbial Phrase, used not only in Scripture,
but

but in prophane Authors, to signifie a narrow Escape out of a great Danger; *He shall be sav'd, yet so as by Fire*, δια πυρὸς out of the Fire; just as δι' ὕδατος is used, 1 Pet. 3. 20. where the Apostle speaking of the eight Persons of Noah's Family, who escaped the Flood, διεσώθησαν δι' ὕδατος, *they escaped out of the Water*. So here this Phrase is to be render'd, *He himself shall escape, yet so as by Fire*. The like Expression you have, Amos 4. 11. *I have pluck'd them as a Fire-brand out of the Fire*. And, Jude 23. *Others save with fear, plucking them out of the Fire*. All which Expressions, signifie the greatness of the Danger, and the difficulty of escaping it; as one, who when his House at midnight is set on fire, and being suddenly wak'd, leaps out of his Bed, and runs naked out of the doors, taking nothing that is within along with him, but employing his whole care to save his Body from the Flames, as St. Chrysostom upon another occasion expresses it. And so the Roman* Orator (who it is likely, did not think of Purgatory) useth this Phrase, *Quo ex Judicio, velut ex incendio, nudus effugit*; from which Judgment or Sentence, he escaped naked, as it were out of a burning: And one of the Greek† Orators tells us, *That to save a Man out of the Fire*, was a common Proverbial Speech.

* Tully.

† Aristides.

To which I shall add, That these words, *so as by Fire*, cannot possibly denote a Purgatory Fire, because, *First*, this Fire is design'd for the Tryal of Mens Works, but Purgatory for the Torment of Mens Souls; *Secondly*, This Fire is to try every Man's Work, even those who build *Gold*, as well as those who build *Hay* and *Stubble*; whereas the Fire of Purgatory only tries those who are guilty of venial Sins; and, as the *Papists* tell us, many there are who never are try'd by it.

And now since *Bellarmino* tells us, That this is one of the most difficult, tho' profitable Texts, (which is true, if by profitable he means gainful, for generally the plainest Texts are most useful,) I hope 'tis by this time manifest, that Purgatory cannot be so plainly prov'd from it, as *N. C.* would have us believe; and therefore till he can bring some other Texts of Scripture which are more to the purpose, and prove this Doctrine of Purgatory more plainly, I am apt to believe the Reader will think that *N. C.* and not the Archbishop, was *mistaken*.

But, *Secondly*, *N. C.* tells us, That he reasonably presumes that *His Grace* could not produce the Testimonies of any Learned Men of the Church of *Rome*, who tell us, That Purgatory cannot be prov'd from Scripture, because he only quotes *Estius*,

who

who, by the Doctor's own Confession, only says, that in his Opinion, the Passage of St. Paul above-cited, does not evince Purgatory; but does not say, that other Passages of Scripture do not.

The Archbishop's Words are these, *All that Estius contends for in this place, is, that it cannot be concluded from hence, there is no Purgatory*; which is somewhat different from those N. C. cites. But, have they no other Authors who say the same thing? And, has the Archbishop cited none? What doth he think of * *Fisher*, Bishop of *Rocheſter*, cited in another place? *Vol. 2. Poſt Obiit. p. 314.* who is of the ſame mind, and which N. C. muſt needs know, becauſe he refers to the very Page in the next Objection. But more than this, does not † *St. Auſtin* himſelf ſay the ſame thing, that Purgatory cannot be prov'd from the Holy Scripture? Tho' 'tis confeſs'd, that he was wavering as to his Opinion, whether there was any Purgatory or not.

Secondly, *His Grace* objects againſt the Belief of Purgatory, that Text, *Rev. 14. 13. I heard a Voice from Heaven ſaying unto me,*

* *De Purgatorio apud priſcos, nulla vel rariffima fiebat mentio. Act. 18. contra Lutherum.*

† *Nec ullus ulli medius locus ut poſſit eſſe niſi cum diabolo, qui non eſt cum Chriſto; tertium penitus ignoramus, imo nec eſſe in Scripturis Sanctis invenimus. St. Auguſtinus de peccatorum meritis & remiſſione. cap. 28.*

write, Blessed are the Dead which die in the Lord, from henceforth: Yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their Labours; and their Works do follow them.

From whence *His Grace* infers, That if *those who die in the Lord* are at rest from all *their Labours* and Pains, then this Text concludes directly against the feigned Purgatory of the Church of *Rome*, which supposeth a great Number, yea, the far greatest part of those *that die in the Lord*, to have obtain'd eternal Redemption by him from Hell; not to pass immediately into Happiness, but to be detain'd somewhere, (they are not certain where, but most probably in the Suburbs of Hell) in great Pain and Torment, equal in degree to that of Hell, and differing only in Duration; I say, to be detained there till their Souls are purg'd from the Defilements they have contracted in this World, and the Debt of temporal Punishments to which they are liable, be some way or other paid off, and discharged.

They suppose indeed, some very few Holy Men to be so perfect at their departure out of this Life, that they do immediately, and without any stop, pass into Heaven, because they need no Purgation; and those likewise who suffer Martyrdom, because they discharge their Debts of temporary Punishments here; but the generality

lity of *Christians* who *die in the Lord*, they suppose so imperfect, as to stand in need of being *purg'd by Fire*, and accordingly that they are detain'd a longer or shorter time, as their Debt of temporary Punishments is greater or less.

But how is it then, that *St. John* says, that those that *dye in the Lord* are happy, because *they rest from their Labours*: If it be so, the far greatest part of those *who dye in the Lord*, are so far from resting from their Labours, that they enter into far greater Pains and Torments, than ever they endur'd in this World. And therefore *Bellarmino*, (that their Doctrine of Purgatory may receive no Prejudice from this Text) would have *from hence forth* in the Text, to be dated from the Day of Judgment, when he supposes the Pains of Purgatory will be at an end. But why, *from hence forth* should take Date from the Day of Judgment, he can give no Reason, but only to save Purgatory, from being condemn'd by this Text. For *St. John* plainly speaks of the Happiness of those that should dye after that time, (whatever it be) that he there describes. But that time cannot be the Day of Judgment, because none shall die after that time.

To which *N. C.* replies: *First*, That this seems to be an obscure and difficult Text of Scripture, because *His Grace*
spends

spends so much Time and Paper in explaining of it : And 2^{dly}, That he allows, that by those who *dye in the Lord*, are meant, those who suffer Martyrdom for Christ's sake. And then he goes on, Railing after his usual manner, without any Fear, Reason, or Wit. ' Wherefore, in my Opinion, (says N.C.) he should have given us ' another Interpretation of this Text, or ' have let Purgatory alone. But 'tis no ' new thing to find the Doctor pull down ' in one Place, what he built in another : And therefore I am not surpriz'd ' to see Purgatory brought in by Head ' and Shoulders, and spoken against, ' in season and out of season. 'Tis Purgatory that reproaches the Sacrileges and ' Depredations of the Doctor's Ancestors ' of worthy Memory, and bears hard upon their Posterity; and upon that account it must be cry'd down; lest the ' Guilt of the Sacrilege of the *Fathers* ' should fly in the Face of the *Children*, and ' give them that Purgatory in this Life, ' which, he would persuade them, they ' shall not meet with in the next.

As to the Difficulty of the Text, *His Grace* tells us, that tho' there is some Difficulty about the Interpretation of some particular Expressions in them; yet the general Sense and Intendment of them is very plain, and so it appears to be, to any
con-

considerate Reader. *Secondly*, That tho' he allows that the Martyrs are certainly included, and perhaps primarily intended, by those *that dye in the Lord*; yet there is no reason to restrain this general Expression to them only. And as for those Railing Accusations, which he brings against both the Church of *England* and the Government, I have said enough already on this Subject; and since 'tis foreign to the Matter in hand, I shall not answer him according to his Folly.

But before I proceed, I shall insert a Paragraph of the Archbishop's, because it contains some proper Arguments against *Purgatory*, and immediately follows the former; and yet *N.C.* does not take the least notice of it.

The Scripture is perpetually silent about this Doctrine of *Purgatory*, tho' there are so many fair Occasions of speaking of it; as in the Parallel of the Rich Man and *Lazarus*, where the Future State is so particularly describ'd, yet there is no mention made, nor the least intimation given of this *Third* State. But besides the Silence of the Scripture about it, there are several Passages utterly inconsistent with it; as, namely, *St. Paul's* Discourse in the beginning of the Fifth Chapter of the Second Epistle to the *Corinthians*, where he plainly declares, the assurance he had that
all

all sincere *Christians*, so soon as they quit the Body, do pass into Happiness ; *For we know, that if our earthly House of this Tabernacle were dissolved, we have a Building of God, a House not made with Hands, eternal in the Heavens.* The plain meaning of which is, That so soon as we quit the one, we shall pass into the other. And this Consideration, he tells us, made *Christians* weary of this World, and willing to die, *ver. 2. For in this we groan earnestly, desiring to be cloath'd upon with our House; which is from Heaven; and, ver. 4. For we that are in this Tabernacle do groan, being burthen'd.* But had *Christians* believ'd, that the greatest part of them, when they left the Body, were to go into Purgatory, to be terribly tormented there, they would not have been in such haste to die, but would have protracted the time as long as they could, and have contentedly born the Burthen of this earthly Tabernacle, rather than to quit it for a Condition a thousand times more intolerable. But *St. Paul* expressly says, That *Christians* know the contrary ; and that as soon as ever they went out of the Body, they should be happy, and with the Lord ; and that this gave them courage against the Fears of Death, *ver. 6. Therefore we are always confident, ὁρῶντες ἑν παντί, bono igitur animo sumus ;* therefore we are always
of

of good courage, knowing that whilst we are at home in the Body, we are absent from the Lord ; and, ver. 8. We are of good courage, I say, and willing rather to be absent from the Body, and present with the Lord. The plain sense of which is, That Christians were willing rather to die than to live, because they knew, that so soon as they left the Body, and departed this Life, they should be present with the Lord. But now if the Doctrine of Purgatory be true, this whole Reasoning of St. Paul proceeds upon a gross mistake ; and therefore I am certain it is not true.

But, as N. C. says, the Third Objection the Doctor brings is, That we have a very considerable substantial Reason to exempt, as few as possibly we can, from going to Purgatory ; because (says he) the more we put in fear of going thither, the Market of Indulgences (as he calls it) riseth the higher, and the profit thence accruing to the Pope's Coffers ; and the more and greater Legacies will be left to the Priests, to hire their saying of Masses for the delivery of Souls out of that Place of Torments.

This I find is *Argumentum ad hominem*, and touches the sensible part of the Popish Emissaries ; their great *Diana* Interest lies at stake in the maintenance of

this Article of their Creed, and therefore 'tis no wonder if *N. C.* grows impatient, and *lays about him*, without regarding Friend or Foe. But not to give my Reader the trouble of an Answer to these ridiculous Expressions of his Passion, let me ask him calmly, Are not these things which the Archbishop objects Matters of Fact? Nay, is not this Doctrine attended with far greater Abuses than any of those which are here instanc'd in? And if so, what Reason had he to cry out? *For shame Doctor! away with such unchristian Scandals, and do not put us upon exposing your Credit and Character any farther, &c.* Certainly, nothing can more expose him and his Party, than such rude Insults as these, upon the Governours of our Church, and even at such a time when they are *over-look'd*, and partake liberally of the unmerited Clemency and Indulgence of the Government.

But *N. C.* has an Argument to prove a Purgatory, which he thinks *unanswerable*, *viz.* that if it doth appear that the Primitive Church did pray for the Dead, that their Sins might be forgiven them; then it will necessarily follow, that they believ'd those Souls they thus pray'd for, to be in a place where they might be help'd and benefited by their Prayers.

But, *First*, praying for the Dead doth not suppose a Purgatory, because the *Antients*

cients pray'd for many of those, whom the *Papists* will acknowledge never were in Purgatory ; as for Patriarchs, Prophets, and Apostles, of whose happy Estate it were Impiety to make any question. *Secondly*, Because we have many instances of those who did believe and practice Prayer for the Dead, and yet never believ'd a Purgatory, as particularly the *Greek Church*.

To this *N. C.* answers ; *First*, By denying that Prayers were made for the Apostles, Martyrs, or the Virgin *Mary*.

Secondly, That 'tis a shameful Evasion to conclude, that the Primitive Church did not believe Purgatory, because they pray'd for the Virgin *Mary*, and the Apostles, and Martyrs.

That Prayers were made for Patriarchs, Prophets, &c. is evident from the Constitutions of *Clement*, *lib. 8. cap. 18.* *Offerimus pro iis qui tibi placuerunt à seculo pro Sanctis Patriarchis, Prophetis, &c.* Nay, as *N. C.* confesses, The *Roman Missal* doth the same now ; it offers up Prayers for, and in honour of the Apostles, Martyrs, and the blessed Virgin *Mary*. But then (says he) these Prayers are not intended for the delivery of their Souls from any Pains, &c. And who ever said they were ? But we say that from hence it is evident, That Prayer for the Dead is not such an *unanswerable* Argument to prove a Purgatory,

because many of those they pray for, by their own Confession, never were in Purgatory; And the Church in the first Ages did not believe a Purgatory, tho' they us'd some sort of Prayer for the Dead.

The truth is, 'twas an early custom in the Primitive Church, to make some kind of Memorial for the Dead, which quickly came to be us'd in form of a Prayer: they thought the Souls were not in perfect Rest and Happiness till the Resurrection; this Opinion they might probably imbibe from the Philosophy of *Plato*, which had too great an Influence on the Opinions of the first *Christians*, and was one Reason why that Caveat of the Apostle was given to them, *to beware of vain Philosophy*. From hence *Origen* took his Notion, that after some time the damn'd in Hell, and even the Devils, should be sav'd. And these Philosophical Opinions, by degrees, were form'd into a belief of Purgatory; which has since been so fruitful of Errors and superstitious Practices, such as Indulgences, Masses for the Dead, Visions, Apparitions, &c. as have tended very much to the discredit of the Christian Religion, and to propagate Irreligion and Atheism in the World; and then 'tis no wonder that this Handle was took hold of, to deprive the Church of those Revenues which were obtain'd by such ill Arts, and apply'd to such superstitious and unwarrantable Uses.

OF INDULGENCES.

CONCERNING Indulgences ; there is so much difference amongst the Popish Writers themselves, that 'tis a very difficult matter to form any just Notion of the Doctrine of the *Church of Rome* about them.

The Council of *Trent* only tells us, *That the Power of Indulgences was left in the Church by Christ, and that the use of them is very helpful to Christian People* ; but doth not determine how and in what manner it is helpful, whether by freeing us from the Guilt or from the Punishment of our Sins ; if from the Punishment, from what sort of Punishment ; whether the Eternal, or Temporal, or the Censures and Discipline of the Church.

'Tis true, *N. C.* tells us, *That 'tis only from the last ; and that Indulgence is nothing else but a Relaxation, or Remission of some part of (or all) those penitential Works to which a Sinner is liable by the Canons of the Church ; which Remission is granted by the Pastors, but especially by the chief Pastor of the Church, upon some weighty Considerations, for the greater benefit and advantage of the Faithful in general. And that the Roman Church*

'neither means by Indulgences, nor pre-
 'tends to any more than the same Power,
 'which the Primitive Fathers both had and
 'practis'd, *i. e.* of dispensing with or re-
 'mitting the Penances prescrib'd by the
 'Canons; nor did ever pretend to dispense
 'with any Man from Repentance for Sins,
 'or Obedience to the Law of God. And
 'that there is not one Divine or Casuist in
 'that Church who doth not hold, that it is
 'sinful and diabolical, even the Sin of *Si-*
 '*mon Magus*, to give or receive any Money
 'for Indulgences. 'Tis confessed indeed,
 'that there have been many Abuses in this
 'matter in the *Church of Rome*, but that
 'they are so far from countenancing or
 'abetting them, that it is their earnest
 'Wishes and the *desire of their Hearts*, that
 'all such should be entirely abolish'd and
 'taken away.

This is a very smooth and plausible Apo-
 logy for one of the vilest and most scanda-
 lous Practices which we charge upon the
Church of Rome, and a Representation of
 Matter of Fact as far remov'd from Truth,
 as Light is from Darkness. But because
His Grace has said very little upon this
 Subject, I shall only make two or three
 Remarks on this Account which *N. C.*
 has given us, and so, for this time, take
 leave of my Author.

And, *First*, will *N. C.* affirm, That In-
 duldence

dulgence is nothing else but a Remission of those Penitential Works, to which a Sinner is liable by the Canons of the Church? But if this was true, what need they talk so much of the Treasure of the Church? Why do their Indulgences run for the Dead, and those who are in Purgatory, as well as the Living? What need is there of the distinctions of Plenary, more Plenary, and most Plenary Indulgences, and such like? And, can there be any thing more evident, than that the Bulls of their Popes, promise a full pardon of all Sins, a freedom from the Guilt as well as the Punishment of Sin? And can we imagine, that if the People did not thus understand them, they would part with so much Money for the purchase of them?

Secondly, He tells us, That the *Roman Church* means nothing else by Indulgences, but the same Power which the Primitive Fathers both had and practis'd. But this is evidently false; neither can he bring any Instance of this Practice in the first Ten Centuries; 'twas a Doctrine that crept into the *Romish Church* after the belief of Purgatory was settled, and upheld solely by the temporal Interest of the *Popes*, and the gainful Markets which they made by it. But this *N. C.* denies, and tells us, That 'tis sinful and diabolical to give or receive any Money for Indulgences, nay,

the Sin of *Simon Magus*; and that none of their Divines or Casuists allow of it.

'Tis very strange that any Man should so confidently deny what can be so easily prov'd; what is evident from History, from the very Bulls of their *Popes*, from their own Writings, and from their constant and daily Practice: This is so notorious, that I shall only give an instance or two of it, and leave the Reader to judge for himself.

And *First*, Did not the Publishing Indulgences, and setting them to Sale, give Occasion to *Luther*, to Preach against the Church of *Rome*? What was it that he found so much Fault with, but that *Leo* the Tenth sending Indulgences throughout all Christendom, set them at high Prices, and collected vast Sums of Money; part of which he distributed to several Persons, and particularly to his Sister * *Magdalen*? Did not *Boniface* the Ninth insert this Clause in his

* *Seguendo questi essemplii Leone, così consigliato dal Cardinal Santi quattro mando una Indulgenza, & remissione de peccati, per tutte le Regioni di Christiani concedendola a chi contribuisse danari & estendendola anco a morti: per i quali quando fosse fatta l'esborsatione, voleva che fossero liberati dalle pene del Purgatorio.*

Im-

his Bulls, *porrigentibus Manus adiutrices*; which in plain *English* is, to those who would give Money for them. Nay is there not a Book extant, entitled, *Taxa Cancellariæ Apostolicæ*, which gives an Account of the different Rates, which Indulgences for several sorts of Sins are set at; and, as an Author of their own complains, not only teaches Men unheard-of Crimes, but gives a Licence for most of them, and Absolution for all, at a very easy Rate? Is it not easy to give a Thousand Evidences of this Matter? And yet this Man will bear us down, that there is no such thing as Buying or Selling Indulgences in the Church of *Rome*: They do so indeed in *Protestant Countries*, where the Practice is not so common; but in *Popish Countries* they turn the Tables; and there you shall hear nothing, but of the Treasury of the Church, and of the Plenitude of Power confer'd upon St. *Peter* and his
 —————
 Suc-

Imperoche havendo egli del 1517, pubblicata la universale concessione delle Indulgenze distribui una parte delle rendite, prima che fossero raccolte, ne ben seminate; donando a diversi le revenute di diverse Provincie & riserbando anco alcune per la sua camera. In particolare dono il tratto delle Indulgenze della Sassonia, & di quel braccio di Germania, che di la camina fino al mare, a Madalena sua Sorella. Hist. del Concil. Trid. p. 4.

Successors, to forgive Sins; and there ~~the~~
the poor People implicitly believe all
that is told them, and practise more than
a *Protestant* can well believe.

But perhaps N. C. will say, That these
are the Abuses he complains of; which
Papists, *with all their Hearts*, desire should
be redress'd. But were not these Abuses
complain'd of, and acknowledg'd long
ago at the Council of *Trent*? And yet
no Redress could be obtain'd for them. Are
not these Abuses practis'd by their Popes,
and Bishops, and Governors of their *Church*,
and continued at this day; and how hei-
nous a Sin must it needs be, by these
Pious Frauds (as some of their own Au-
thors term them) not only to cheat the
People of their Goods, but to lull them
into a deep and fatal Security; and ruine
their Souls, under pretence of pardoning
their Sins. Nay is not the Assent to this
Doctrine made an Article of Faith, abso-
lutely necessary to be believ'd, in order
to Salvation, by every Member of the
Christian Church?

Well, but says N.C. 'Where is the harm
'of Believing this and the other Points of
'the *Popish* Faith; tho' we have not so
'much Assurance of their being Divine
'Truths, as we have of other things, how
'can this hurt any body? But there is
'infinite Harm in not believing, because
'the

‘ the Church of *Rome* has commanded us
 ‘ to believe and hear, (to hear and be-
 lieve, it should be) ‘ on Pain of being
 ‘ reputed Hereticks and Publicans. Sup-
 ‘ pose it should happen, that the Points in
 ‘ Dispute were not commanded by Christ
 ‘ and his Apostles ; where is the Harm
 ‘ in believing them, since we are com-
 ‘ manded so to do by the Church ?

To which I answer, That True Faith is
 an Assent founded upon Rational Mo-
 tives, and that to assent to any thing with-
 out knowing why or wherefore, is not
 Faith, but Credulity ; which is so far from
 being commendable, that it generally
 betrays Men into the most sottish Errors,
 and the most superstitious and unreason-
 able Practices. God has given us the Holy
 Scripture to be the Rule of our Faith, and
 the Guide of our Actions ; he has given
 us a Rational Soul to consider them, and
 make use of them to our Comfort and
 Advantage ; he expects that we should
 offer him up the Service of a Man, a Ra-
 tional Service, proceeding from Choice
 and Knowledge, and directed by those
 Rules which he has given us ; and who-
 ever worships him with Inventions of his
 own Brain, and gives himself up to the
 Conduct of those Blind Guides, whose
 Design is to make Merchandize of their
 Profelytes, and whose whole Religion is
 only

only an Art to support the Temporal Greatness of the Church of *Rome*, instead of a *Well done, good and faithful Servant*, will be ask'd, *Who required these things from him?* But this is not all: For there are several of the Doctrines of the Church of *Rome*, which necessarily engage Men in the Practice of the most heinous Sins; such as Superstition, Uncharitableness, *Idolatry*; and expose the best meaning Men of their Communion to apparent Danger of Eternal Damnation: But for those who have been bred *Protestants*, and knowingly and willingly run into these Sins, I will leave them to God's Mercy; but can give them no Hopes of Salvation at all, according to the Tenor of the Gospel.

And because they glory so much in the Number of their Profelytes, and how many they bring over to the *Popish Religion*; whereas, as *N. C.* tells us, the *Protestant Faith* doth not make any Progress. I shall conclude with a Passage or two from the Archbishop's Sermons, *Edit. post Obi.* shewing us in some measure the Reason of it. 'And here, says *His Grace*, I might take notice likewise, what worldly and indirect Means they commonly make use of, to make Disciples and gain Profelytes, by Flattery and Falshood, by concealing and misrepresenting their Doctrines and Practices, by defaming
their

their Adversaries with known Fictions & Calumnies; tempting Men from their Religion by Promises of Temporal Advantages; which when they have gain'd them, they do not always make good. Can any thing be more opposite to the Genius of the Christian Religion, than to promote it by Means so plainly contrary to the very Nature and Design of it? It must be confess'd, that nothing can be more serviceable to the Religion of the Church of *Rome*; for such a Religion as is calculated for the promoting Secular Interest, is to be carried on by Secular Arts. And of this (says *His Grace*) we have a Famous Instance in that Worldly and Secular Church; which now for several Hundred Years hath more pursued the End of Secular Greatness and Dominion, than any other Church hath done the Ends of True Religion, the Glory of God, and the Salvation of Men's Souls. So that there is hardly any Doctrine or Practice peculiar to that Church, and differing from our common Christianity, but it hath a direct and visible tendency to the promoting of some Worldly Interest or other. For Instance, Why do they deny the People the Holy Scriptures, and the Service of God in such a Language which they can understand? But that by keep-
ing

ing them in Ignorance, they may have them in more perfect Slavery and Subjection to them? Why do they forbid their Priests to Marry? But that they may have no Interest distinct from that of their Church, and leave all to it when they dye? To what End is Auricular Confession? But to keep People in Awe, by the knowledge of their Secrets? Why must the Laity only receive the Sacrament in One Kind, but to draw a greater Reverence to the Priest, whose Privilege it shall be to receive in Both? And why is the Intention of the Priest necessary to the Efficacy of the Sacraments? But to persuade the People, that notwithstanding the Gracious Intention of God towards Mankind, they cannot be sav'd without the Goodness of the Priest? The Doctrines of Purgatory and Indulgences, are a plain Device to make their Markets of the Sins and Souls of Men, &c. I might instance in a Hundred Things more in that Church, which are of the same tendency. But that which is most remarkable is, that St. John foretold, that it should be the Character of Antichrist; that he should be of a Worldly Spirit, and the Doctrines such as should serve a Secular Interest and Design; 1 *Job.* 4. 5. *They are of the World, and they speak from the World, and the World bears them.*

And tho' I do not from hence infer,
that

the *Pope* is Antichrist, as some have done; yet I think I have reason to say with my Lord *Bacon*; That if a Hue and Cry should come after *Antichrist*, which should describe him by those *Characters*, by which he is decypher'd in the *Bible*, the *Pope* would certainly be apprehended for him.

And now having given a short, but I hope a distinct and satisfactory Answer to to all those *Objections N. C.* has brought against the *Archbishop's* Sermons; I shall conclude with the Profession of a Sincere *Love* and *Heartly Good Will* to the Persons of our Adversaries; and my Prayers, That what I have Writ may be useful to open their Eyes, and convince their Judgments; *That they may see in this their Day, the things which belong to their Peace, and Eternal Welfare.* And to this End:

O Lord, we beseech thee to keep thy Church and Household continually in thy true Religion; that they who do lean only upon the Hope of thy Heavenly Grace, may evermore be defended by thy mighty Power, through Jesus Christ our Lord.

O Lord, who hast taught us, that all our doings without Charity are nothing worth, send thy Holy Ghost, and pour into our Hearts that most excellent Gift

*Gift of Charity, the very Band of Peace,
and of all Virtues; without which who-
soever liveth, is counted dead before
thee. Grant this for thy only Son Jesus
Christ his sake. Amen. Amen.*

F I N I S.

ADVERTISEMENT.

I have here inserted the chief of the Errata,
which either pervert or obscure the
Sense. Many more there are, (especially
when I quote N. C.'s own Words, which I
have taken care punctually to transcribe)
which are not to be imputed to the Press.

Θ NO 63

ERRATA.

P Ag. 10. l. 14. r. day appointed for. p. 11. l. 14.
r. second. p. 26. l. 19. r. Greek. p. 34. l. 23. r. no,
not St. Peter. p. 39. l. 5. r. as a new. p. 44. l. 20. r. his.
p. 45. l. 12. r. these. p. 67. r. nibble at. p. 70. l. penult.
r. intended. p. 88. l. 13. r. as. p. 81. l. 15. r. and this.
p. 84. l. 21. r. the. p. 106. l. 6. r. vend such. p. 109.
l. 15. r. integrum. p. 109. l. 31. r. thus. p. 113. l. 4. r.
for. p. 122. penult. r. γλασῶν. p. 131. r. permittatur.
p. 138. l. 5. r. of. p. 131. l. 8. dele as, 135, l. 23. dele that,
p. 156. l. 3. r. was.

